

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**24th Day**

**Tuesday, March 28, 1972.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**INTRODUCTION OF AIR CADETS**

**Hon. N.E. Byers (Kelvington):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to introduce to you and to Members of the Assembly 34 members of the Foam Lake Air Cadet Squadron No. 542 seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied here today by Constable D.K. Smith, their Drill Officer, Mr. Bill Klebeck, a member of the Civilian Committee and Mr. Harry Obtosoway, their bus driver. This particular air squadron placed first in Saskatchewan in 1971 obtaining some 96.5 points in that competition. In the last five years they have obtained an average of over 95 points. In addition they have won a number of individual awards for attendance and discipline. It was my good fortune, Mr. Speaker, to have a number of these young men as my students in the days when I was in the teaching profession. I hope that all Members of the Assembly will join with me in welcoming this air cadet squadron on their visit to the Legislature. We hope that their visit this afternoon will be enjoyable and educational and that their trip home will be pleasant and that we may welcome them again in this Legislature at some future time.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**INTRODUCTION OF SCOUTS**

**Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, it is an extreme pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Assembly a group of scouts, some seven in number, I believe, from Weyburn. They are a portion of the 5th Weyburn Scout Troop. They are accompanied by their Scout Master, Mr. Dale Hoff and their driver, Mr. Malcolm MacNeil. I am sure I express the wishes of us all, Mr. Speaker, when I say we hope their visit here will prove educational and that they might profit from it and that their entire tour today might be of the same and that their journey home might also be pleasant and safe.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**INTRODUCTION OF AIR CADETS**

**Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be able to introduce a fine group of air cadets seated in the gallery to your left numbering in 40, 26 from Birch Hills and 14 from Melfort. They have been a very active group in Birch Hills for 10 years and in Melfort for over 30 years. They have won several flying scholarships and other awards. They are led here by Captain Grant Getz from Birch Hills, Doug. Carswell from Melfort, Ron Assen, the bus driver from Melfort, Tom Hunter, Secretary of the Sponsoring Committee from Birch Hills. They have already visited the Moose Jaw Base and on their tour they have visited the Museum of Natural History and they are visiting the

Legislature now. I hope that their stay here and their tour will be very educational. They are also on their way to visit Minot, North Dakota which is in the neighboring country and I am sure that their trip is going to be very educational. I hope the House will join with me in extending them a very profitable and educational tour and also a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **CONGRATULATIONS CHAMPION BULL**

**Mr. T.L. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the Grand Champion Hereford Bull of this year's show and sale was owned and shown by Tag and Al Greaves of Fillmore. Fillmore is a town in the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency that I represent and is also my home town. I wish to extend the congratulations of this House to the family farm that captured the highest award at this show.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## **QUESTIONS**

### **ALLOCATION OF SCHOOL GRANTS**

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). Would the Minister reconsider and re-establish the principle of budget review in order that legitimate negotiations might go on between school boards and the Department of Education instead of the most vicious and dictatorial allocation of school grants ever seen in Saskatchewan? I have just heard from the Woodrow School Unit, Mr. Speaker, and their school grant is down \$160,000 this year. They've just had a reassessment from \$1.7 million to \$2.3 million. Will the Minister reconsider and re-establish some legitimate negotiation with school units?

**Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member from Milestone, if he recalls in my speech during the Budget debate when I outlined the grant formula, I indicated to the House at that time that budget reviews were still in effect. Our Department people are sitting down with the boards in their board office and suggesting to the boards what their budgets might be. If he in his question is referring to the fact that we are ready as a Department to sit down with the boards who have problems as a result of the grant formula which attempts to bring in equity in opportunity, equity in financing, we certainly are. And boards are coming in, we are sitting down with them, we're looking at their problems and we will be prepared to review those problems once they are all before us.

### **REDUCTION GRANT FOR REGINA SCHOOL UNIT 21**

**Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, a question to the Hon. Minister of Education. What steps has the Minister

of Education taken to reduce the plight of Regina School Unit No. 21 which will see a reduction in its grant of over \$130,000 this year with a concomitant mill rate increase of 5.5 mills?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — In answer to the Member from Lumsden, I have not as yet heard from the Regina Unit Board. That isn't to say that they haven't contacted my office wishing to meet with us. As I indicated to the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), we are certainly prepared to meet with them to discuss their problem. I don't think that a mill rate rise to 35 or 36 mills in the Regina Unit is out of the way by comparison to mill rates across the province. The grant formula does bring equity in finance. We indicated that. We indicated that in our speech that the mill rates would rise in some areas. By the way, of 130 school systems there are only eight systems that received a significant reduction in grant from last year by application of the formula.

**Mr. Lane:** — Supplementary question. When does the Minister of Education intend to table before the House the grants throughout the province for the various units?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — The grants have been sent to the various school systems across the province. I think that since this is public business, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite and Members on this side can certainly call their Board offices and find out what the grants are.

#### **RENEGOTIATE ROSETOWN SCHOOL UNIT NO. 43 GRANT DECREASE**

**Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. I was wondering if he would consider renegotiating with the Rosetown School Unit No. 43 which has a decrease in grant review this year of \$62,000 from the \$694,000 they received in 1971 with a projected decrease of \$45,000 for 1973. To balance the budget in 1972 would require an estimated increase from the 1971 rate of 41 mills to 43 mills.

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — Mr. Speaker, I should certainly be willing to meet with the Rosetown people. If they will just contact my office, we can arrange such a meeting.

#### **CONGRATULATIONS**

#### **HUMBOLDT BRONCOS WIN JUNIOR HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP**

**Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I take extreme pleasure in bringing to the attention of this House and to yourself a very important event that occurred in Humboldt last night. I mentioned in my comments during the debate on the Speech from the Throne that Humboldt was one of those rare towns of its size that has a Junior A Hockey Team. Well, Mr. Speaker, last night that hockey team, the Humboldt Broncos won the Saskatchewan Provincial Junior Hockey Championship by defeating Melville in the fifth game in a best of seven series.

I want to say to the Member for Melville that the Melville Millionaires were certainly worthy opponents and either of the

two teams could have represented Saskatchewan equally well. I know that the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and the Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacMurchy) both of whom have some playing in the Saskatchewan Amateur Junior Hockey League are particularly interested in this league and in the hockey which is hockey of an extremely high calibre. I know that the Members of this House will join me in congratulating the Broncos and wishing them well as they proceed to play Manitoba in inter-provincial playoffs.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### **HUMBOLDT BRONCOS HOCKEY TEAM**

**Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my most sincere congratulations to these Humboldt Broncos. They did a tremendous job. They are good sportsmen. And all I want to say, Mr. Speaker, Melville is known for its hockey, but all I want to say is the best team doesn't always win.

### **LUMSDEN WOMEN'S VOLLEY BALL TEAM**

**Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I am sure the House would like to join with me in congratulating the Lumsden High School Women's Volley Ball Team for coming second in the Canadian Women's Volley Ball Championships. In the national final they lost two games out of three. They put on a very spirited display, I understand. They are certainly one of the very best volley ball teams in the province. I am sure the House would like to join with me in congratulating them for their efforts.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### **POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE**

#### **GRANT FORMULA FOR SCHOOL UNITS**

**Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a personal or House privilege if you like, in response to the Minister of Education's comments that he wasn't going to supply us with figures of the grants to the school boards in the province. The Premier a few days ago assured me that they would be forthcoming. It has been customary in this House for many years. I would certainly ask the Minister and the Premier to reconsider this. If the grant formula and the grants are as good as the Minister is trying to tell us, he's got nothing to hide, let's have the news and answers to some of these questions.

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — Mr. Speaker, certainly I don't have anything to hide. If it has been the practice of this House to table the grant figures, I'll certainly be prepared to do this and I'll make them available to the House as soon as we can make preparation for it in the Department.

## MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

### RETURN NO. 62

**Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 62 showing:

- (1) The number of final orders of foreclosure that were granted in the Province of Saskatchewan for the following periods of time (a) from July 1, 1971 to February 19, 1972, (b) from January 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972, (c) for each of the years from 1956 to 1970, inclusive.
- (2) For each such year the number of consents that were granted by the Provincial Mediation Board for the enforcements of Writs of Possession.
- (3) For each such year and number of the foregoing that were Farm Credit Corporation mortgages.
- (4) The number in each year that related to farm lands.

**Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General):** — I would propose an amendment moved by my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that we amend Return No. 62 as follows:

That (a) the date “June 30, 1972” be deleted where it appears in subclause (b) of clause (1) and the date “June 30, 1971” be substituted therefor.

(b) clause (2) be deleted and the words “For each such period the number of Writs of Possession of which the Provincial Mediation Board has had notice” be substituted therefor.

(c) the word “year” be deleted in clause (3) and the word “period” be substituted therefor.

(d) the word “year” be deleted in clause (4) and the word “period” be substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### RETURN NO. 63

**Mr. MacLeod** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 63 showing:

- (1) The number of final orders for cancellation of agreements for sale that were granted in the Province of Saskatchewan for the following periods of time (a) from July 1, 1971 to February 29, 1972, (b) from January 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972, (c) for each of the years from 1956 to 1970, inclusive.
- (2) For each such year the number of consents that were

granted by the Provincial Mediation Board for the enforcement of Writs of Possession.

(3) The number in each year that related to farm lands.

**Mr. Romanow:** — I move, seconded by my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Motion for Return No. 63 be amended as follows:

That (a) the date “June 30, 1972” be deleted where it appears in subclause (b) of clause (1) and the date “June 30, 1971” be substituted therefor.

(b) clause (2) be deleted and the words “for each such period the numbers of Writs of Possession of which the Provincial Mediation Board has had notice” be substituted therefor.

(c) that the word “year” where it appears in clause (3) be deleted and the word “period” be substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## STATEMENT

### PREAMBLE IN MOTIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before the Member proceeds with this Resolution I have a little statement I should like to read to the House which covers this motion (Resolution No. 2) and one other on the Order Paper:

I wish to draw all Members' attention to Resolution (No. 2) as it stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Melville. Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, page 296, defines a substantive motion as a “self-contained proposal submitted for the approval of the House and drafted in such a way as to be capable of expressing a decision of the House”. I would remind all Members that the practice of this Assembly has been to have the substantive motions succinct and clear without preambles in order that the motion would be capable of expressing decision. Arguments that are presented in preambles, can be used in the debate itself but should not be included in the Resolution.

Resolution (No. 2), in my opinion, contains a preamble. In Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, 1958, Cit 199 (1), page 167, this situation is covered as follows: “When a member hands a motion to the Speaker after having spoken in support of it, the Speaker may, before putting the question to the House, make such corrections as are necessary or advisable in order that it should conform with the usages of the House”.

I would draw attention to a Speaker's ruling as recorded in the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, March 17, 1970, pages 96 and 97, where Mr. Speaker altered the wording of a private member's resolution in order to make it conform with the

accepted practice of this Assembly.

The Chair will delete the words "recognizing that grain markets are limited and farmers are marketing grain at prices below the cost of production", from the Resolution in order that the preamble will be removed.

I also wish to draw all Hon. Members' attention to Resolution (No. 6), standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre which also contains a preamble. For the same reasons as given above, the Chair will delete the words "being seriously disturbed by the intolerably high level of unemployment, particularly among young people, and recognizing that the lack of jobs is a direct consequence of gross mismanagement of the Canadian economy by the Federal Government . . ." from the Resolution in order that the preamble will be removed.

I think this will explain the reason I am ruling out the preamble on this motion and on motion (No. 6) and the Members will be able to speak accordingly.

## **RESOLUTIONS**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 2 – INCOME STABILIZATION PROGRAM FOR PRAIRIE FARMERS**

**Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville)** moved, seconded by Mr. Larson (Pelly):

That this Assembly urges the Federal Government to proceed immediately with legislation to establish an income stabilization program for prairie farmers, which program would include the following:

- (1) A guarantee that total grain receipts in the prairie region will not fall below \$1.1 million during the 1971-72 crop year, and that this figure be adjusted in subsequent years to take into account costs of production;
- (2) The establishment of a Stabilization Fund for the purposes of this program, with contributions from producers; consumers through a two-price system for wheat; and the Federal Government, through an annual contribution from the Treasury;
- (3) A payout from the Stabilization Fund in any crop year that gross receipts fall below the guaranteed minimum, with distribution on the basis of the numbers of bushels of grain delivered, such payment to be included in the final payment made by the Canadian Wheat Board.

He said:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, we shall abide by your ruling. That portion of the motion will be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, the other day when I rose in this Assembly to give notice of motion that I would move a well-defined motion, in fact, according to your ruling, Sir, it was too well defined, urging the Federal Government to proceed immediately with legislation to establish an income stabilization program for

prairie farmers, there were loud cries of derision and mockery from the Opposition benches, none louder than that of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) himself, Mr. Speaker. Mockery and derision and scorn because our Party dares once more to bring to the attention of this Assembly and to the attention of all the farmers in the West, that we, in the New Democratic Party, be it Provincial or Federal, believe most strongly, most dynamically, in a good, sound, basic stabilization program for western farmers.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Not only do we dare, Mr. Speaker, once more to raise our voices louder than ever in the hope that the real farm price stabilization will eventually become a reality, but we will continue without stop right here in this Legislature and in the city and in the country on any political and non-political platforms and all through the West to place again and again our support for a farm income stabilization program. Because, Mr. Speaker, only if such a stabilization program becomes a reality can there ever be a hope for the survival of our family farms, our small and large rural communities, our Saskatchewan as we know it today.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we dare to bring this motion into this House and we dare the Opposition to vote for it, Mr. Speaker. We want a strong, loud, unanimous Yes from this Legislature for a strong, viable, effective stabilization program for the western farmer. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Members to your left will as they did the other day, laugh and say derisively, “Why, your New Democrats in Ottawa had a chance to support a stabilization program, why didn’t they support it?” That’s right, that’s the question they are going to ask. May I say to you, Sir, how thankful I am and how thankful we all are that our New Democratic Members have not weakened like our Conservative Members in Ottawa . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — . . . that our New Democratic Members in Ottawa have not weakened like our Conservative fence-sitters and the Liberal Members in Ottawa. They had the courage to fight right down to the wire.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was no doubt that the \$100 million carrot was tempting but the solemn realization that with the carrot came years of a program that would stabilize nothing, that in reality a vote for Bill C-244 was a vote for the Federal Task Force Report and the extermination of two-thirds of our farmers off the land and that made our Federal Members fight and vote the way they did. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that program offered by Otto Lang to which was tied ahead of it a big dangling million dollar carrot was baited with a pretty deadly poison. Political expediency would have been easy, Mr. Speaker, but if you look at the long term outlook of that stabilization program, the prospect virtually condemned the western farmer to almost total annihilation. It would have meant a few dollars for the farmer in that million dollar bait but salvation of the agricultural industry would not have been achieved, Mr. Speaker. The agricultural industry would not have been stabilized.



If the Stabilization Bill in such a form was what was needed, why did all the other farm organizations oppose it? The Farmers' Union, The Wheat Pool, The Federation of Agriculture. If the stabilizing effects were that acceptable, why wasn't the Bill broken into the two parts as suggested by our Federal New Democrat counterparts, to break the \$100 million benefit from the rest of the Bill? I don't think I need to repeat to anyone in this House why this wasn't done. Because you had to accept the arsenic with the food, Mr. Speaker, that is why. That is where Otto Lang and his Ottawa Liberals and I must say the Conservatives as well, have totally discredited themselves. They have shown what political expediency they were prepared to go to. To hold out such a poisoned stabilization Bill was mocking, Mr. Speaker, and baiting the farmers, insulting them in fact, saying, 'crawl, you former, crawl if you want some of these goodies'. That's what it said.

But thank God, Mr. Speaker, our western people, our western New Democrats, did not crawl. No, Mr. Lang practised the role of a bully gunfighter, Mr. Speaker, by pointing a gun at the farmers' heads, knowing in what a vulnerable and weak position the farmers were in, sure that the farmers would weaken and come a-crawling but they didn't. Mr. Lang got his answer in Assiniboia correctly, and, Mr. Speaker, he'll get it again come election day whenever that will be.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Why was this Stabilization Bill so unacceptable to the western farmers and the western farm organizations? Why did our New Democrats fight it and oppose many of its features so bitterly? There are many reasons, Sir, and let me enunciate some of these reasons to you. The farmers have never forgotten the iniquitous PFAA program foisted on the farmers for years, costing millions of dollars to farmers, many who never benefited at all, having no stabilization effect in times of dire financial distress. Yes, we had calculated and recalculated this harshly imposed Lang Stabilization Bill and found that it wasn't even up to par with the PFAA. When you consider the increased costs of production sky-rocketing then what good is this type of stabilization when the farmers' income is not protected at all?

The first basic defect in this Stabilization Bill C-244 was that it had the total effect of stabilizing poverty. I know that is a rather harsh way of expressing it but there is no way that describes its attributes as does the word 'poverty'.

The other day the mover to the Throne Speech, the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) made reference to the Senate Committee Report on Poverty in Canada wherein it was stated that 29 per cent of the people of Canada are on or below the poverty level. The plan that Mr. Lang and the Liberals at Ottawa had for the farmer would have, in fact, done just that for the great majority of the farmers in Canada — frozen stabilization at a poverty level. A plan such as this designed to stabilize cash receipts at current levels assumes that the income level of the past five years is an adequate base. This is absolute nonsense, Mr. Speaker. As I have said before, this would be even worse than the PFAA, as we all know, quite useless.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the plan did not take into account the cost of production. A stabilization plan to stabilize cash

receipts is of no value in the face of almost daily rising costs of production. Another factor to consider, Mr. Speaker, in any Bill of this kind will be the many inequities resulting from the application of this formula to individual farm situations. For many reasons, including a wide variety of crop conditions across the prairies that vary from year to year as we all know, would make the plan quite inapplicable and unworkable as it was proposed.

Mr. Speaker, the Government's portion of contribution designed to be limited and finally phased out is and in the opinion of many farmers in Western Canada as well, totally unacceptable. We want a stabilization plan that will guarantee that the total grain receipts in the prairie region will not fall below the \$1.1 billion during the 1971-72 crop year and that a stabilization fund for this purpose be guaranteed through an annual contribution from Treasury.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies to any government for asking and demanding this kind of support. You know, Sir, that it was but a few weeks ago that the editorials of the Saskatchewan daily newspapers were crying crocodile tears for dear old free enterprise and what was happening to this sanctified free enterprise system when the announcement was made that finally the Meadow Lake pulp mill deal was written 'finis', the paper dared print such an obituary right on the editorial page – dear free enterprise had received another death blow.

Nothing angers me more, Mr. Speaker, than such deliberate distortions that somehow a system that sucked millions and billions of dollars out of our national and provincial treasuries for years was and still is considered to be free enterprise. When you look around you, Mr. Speaker, there is hardly an industry in Canada today that isn't subsidized through tariffs, tax write-offs and many hundreds of other ways as so well expressed by the Member for Assiniboia-Bengough (Mr. Lange). And yet the people are led to believe the myth that it is all free enterprise. Probably the only industrialist in Canada today who is a free enterpriser is the farmer. Mr. Speaker, it is time that we, the farmers of Canada and Saskatchewan, got part of that action. It is time that the Federal Government put its money where its mouth is, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud that the New Democrats fought this iniquitous Bill, carrot-dangling Bill, to the very end. Yes and many of us lost money. I lost money as many other farmers did because we got that fine letter from Ottawa saying that we were entitled to \$540 or \$620 and then we didn't get it of course. We lost money, many of us lost money. We lost the battle but we didn't lose the war, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — The Conservatives in Ottawa too showed their true colors when it came to political expediency (so they thought), Mr. Speaker. So they thought! They sold out but our New Democrats said, "We'll not be swayed, we will abide by our principles." And I am very proud of them for it. Our proof of action was decided, Mr. Speaker, at the 'Battle of Assiniboia'. It was there on the battlefield of Assiniboia that certain polarization of the thinking of western farmers took place. It was at Assiniboia that the people of Saskatchewan told Otto Lang, "Go dangle your carrot elsewhere." It was at Assiniboia that

the farmers told Otto Lang, "You tried to buy us with our own \$100 million but we are not buying." It was there at Assiniboia that Mr. Lang and Ottawa were told and they knew that there was no more dilly-dallying in regard to the two-price wheat system, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the ballots that were deposited in the election at Assiniboia and the ballots deposited in the next Federal election will determine what kind of a Stabilization Bill we will eventually have for the prairie farmers.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, the strength of our western economy depends to the greatest degree upon our agricultural industry. The strength of our Canadian economy, Mr. Speaker, as exemplified by its rough shape in the last few years bears out the fact that the strength of our national economy is to the greatest degree determined by the strength of our agricultural buoyancy and agricultural economy in the West.

In no way can our country, can our Canada forget about the western people. No Government of Canada if it really believes in a nation from sea to sea can ever again take chances of ignoring any one sector of this country including the West, Mr. Speaker.

No Government, no political party in Western Canada can afford to sit still, including the Liberals to your left, Mr. Speaker, and not place themselves along the side of the agricultural industry of Western Canada. And that means, Mr. Speaker, an all out support of a Stabilization Bill with real teeth in it.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, the most successful crop insurance program, the most comprehensive family farm protection legislation, the greatest diversification program ever imaginable, efficiency, mechanization and a thousand other remedies to the agricultural industry will indeed be futile if we do not get a stabilization program wherein the cost of production of agricultural products will be tied to the income received from the sale of these farm products, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — I am hoping that the motion that I bring forth today, Mr. Speaker, will be endorsed and approved by this House. It has given me great pleasure to read this motion to you.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that we are going to have a debate in this Assembly in regard to the Stabilization Bill because, once again, we are following what has happened in the country. There has already been a debate in the country and as the previous speaker indicated, that took place in Assiniboia.

Before that by-election took place every politician of every Party in this province and in this country said that the issue in Assiniboia is going to be the Grains Income Stabilization Bill. That is what the issue was before the election but

after the overwhelming defeat of the Liberal candidate he didn't come first or second, but came third, that was no longer the issue. In fact, what had happened was that somehow the city slickers, in the city of Weyburn had defeated the Liberal candidate. Now, it is true that he did lose by some 1,000 votes in the city of Weyburn but if you were to take those votes out of the votes cast in the Assiniboia by-election, you would find that he also lost by some 2,000 in the areas outside of Weyburn.

There is no question about it that the principles of the Grains Stabilization Bill as enunciated by Otto Lang were tested, they were tried by the people of Saskatchewan in that by-election and they were found wanting. And the basic principle which was found wanting was that there was no consideration for the increased cost of production to the farmer. This is a point that had been raised by all the major farm organizations in Canada – the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Manitoba Wheat Pool, the Alberta Wheat Pool, the National Farmers' Union, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture – all of these farm organizations for the first time in the history of Canada had united in opposition to a stabilization plan which, as had been indicated, would have bound the farmers of Saskatchewan to poverty.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in regard to this motion. I have more comments that I should like to make in regard to this motion and so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 5 – PROPERTY TAX REDUCTION FOR EDUCATION**

**Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin)** moved, seconded by Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie):

That the Government of Saskatchewan give consideration to take the necessary steps to reduce the property tax for education to 25 mills.

He said

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone in Saskatchewan is aware of the promise made by the NDP to reduce the mill rate for education to 25 mills. I am sure that every Member over there, every candidate, used this in the campaign. The promise was repeated over and over and everyone in the province is certainly aware of it.

The impression was left with the people of the province that this would be done immediately, not two, five or ten years from now. Either or ten months have gone by and nothing has been done to carry out this major promise. The average mill rate for education in 1970 was 45 mills in this province. The total taxable assessment was about \$2 billion, that is including both urban and rural.

If the mill rate was reduced to 25 mills as promised, the property tax for education would be reduced by about \$40 million. Now, every year that the NDP put off their very clear cut promise they are cheating the property owners out of this \$40 million. They said they would reduce it to 25 mills. This would save the

March 28, 1972

property owner \$40 million and they are not doing it. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, the urgency of this particular promise. It leaves the burden of this extra \$40 million on the property owner.

This year would have been an ideal time to do it. The Liberal Government in Ottawa gave this province an extra \$59 million. This money could have been easily used to reduce the property taxes instead of hiring a horde of planners and civil servants. The Liberal Government introduced the Homeowner Grant. They raised it, as you know, gradually to \$70. Plans were made to increase it to \$100.

The homeowner, the large homeowner, will get \$8 more. Only \$8! Not up to \$100 that he would have gotten under the Liberals, he will get \$8. The average and small homeowner will get nothing, he will get no increase.

The Property Improvement Grants proposed are only a minor change in the Liberal Homeowner Grant. The Property Improvement Grants are very similar to the Homeowner Grant. The PIG is the same as the HOG. The only thing is that the PIG that we have now is smaller than the HOG that we had before.

The Property Improvement Grant makes no attempt to keep the mill rate down. No attempt at all! It reduces the mill rate by some 13 mills for some and only some property owners and it does away completely with the Homeowner Grant.

The Premier said in the Budget Speech that under the new Property Improvement Grant that no homeowner would be worse off. I am sure that everyone is aware by now, everyone that reads the paper, that every homeowner in both Regina and Moose Jaw will be worse off than they were before. Regina and Moose Jaw are talking of mill rate increase of five or six mills. They have to do this because the NDP Government is not supplying enough money to keep the services down, the essential services that they require. So they will get an extra \$8, the larger homeowner, the richer person. Everyone else will get no more and his taxes will go up by five or six mills.

School units are now receiving notices from the NDP Government which indicate that grants will not meet increased costs. They have been told in effect that if they want their education services to be maintained at a decent level and certainly most people want this, that they will have to raise the money themselves or they will have to increase the property taxes.

We have seen many instances of this. Moosomin School Unit, for example, has reduced their mill rate the last three years in a row under the Liberal Government. I am wondering if the Premier or the Minister of Education will now guarantee that sufficient grants will be paid to Moosomin to allow them to continue this practice of reducing their mill rates. I doubt if we shall get such a guarantee. With the increased mill rates, in two or three years property owners will be paying as much taxes as before and their Homeowner Grant will be completely gone.

The property taxes for education should be drastically reduced. It is only the last few days, Mr. Speaker, that it has come to our attention that the Government is failing dismally

in this regard. Arcola School Unit in which I live finds that they are going to have a one mill increase this year under the NDP. Last year under a Liberal Government they had a two mill decrease. Now I am sure that the Premier is not going to tell me that the Arcola School Unit area is one of the more prosperous in the province. This is an area of mixed farming, small farmers and certainly this is an area where the mill rate has gone up one mill this year, two mills down last year.

Moosomin School Unit as I have mentioned is the same. Let's look at the record over the last three years. I have here the front page of the Moosomin World Spectator and I should like to take a look first at April 8, 1970, this is two years ago. The headline says "Moosomin Unit Board Cuts Mill Rates". It goes on to say:

Moosomin School Unit Board has cut the mill rate for the second year in a row, Board Chairman Douglas Fyke told the World Spectator last week. This year's reduction is one and one-half mills for unit ratepayers, the same drop as last year.

So in 1969 and in 1970 the Moosomin School Unit dropped the mill rate by one and one-half mills.

I have here the front page of the same paper, May 12, 1971, one year ago. It says in the headline "School Taxes Slashed". I quote from this paper,

A reduction of up to five and a half mills in the school rate is in store for most taxpayers in the Moosomin School Unit. The 1971 rates were announced from the unit office last week. This is a reduction from last year of five and one-half mills for Moosomin, four and one-half mills for all towns and villages and three and one-half mills for rural taxpayers.

This is the record that we have in 1969, 1970 and 1971 in the Moosomin School Unit.

I should again like to ask the Minister and the Premier if they will assure the people of the Moosomin School Unit that this type of reduction will be possible. This program was started by the Liberal Government, continued for the last three years and I am wondering if they will guarantee that the people in the Moosomin School Unit will be able to benefit by such reductions in the future. In fact, I think they are rather disillusioned by some of the recent events from this Government. They would probably be satisfied with a promise that they would get enough money to even maintain the mill rate without any reduction.

I am sure most of you also, Mr. Speaker, noticed in the Leader-Post of March 23, 1972 – "Rural Taxes to Rise".

Trustees of the Regina School Unit are expecting their farmers and businessmen to raise cain when they learn the board will have to increase their mill rate.

I don't blame them too much. I think they are perfectly justified in raising cain. It goes on to say,

The board has suffered a reduction of \$130,000 grant under the new Provincial school grant system and expects

a four mill increase will be necessary.

I think the big problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier doesn't seem to know which way you have to go if you have a 37 mill rate and want to get it down to 25. This seems to be perhaps the basic problem. We should like to point out to him that it is necessary to start moving in a lower direction. You don't go back to 25 by putting a 37 mill rate up to 38 or 40 as is being done in many instances.

Education, we all know, is certainly a people's service and should be paid for by a people's tax such as sales tax or income tax. Property taxes should only be used for services to provide services to property such as roads and police services. Forty or fifty years ago in rural areas the local school was supported by a tax on each quarter section. The towns and villages had a tax on houses or businesses. This system was certainly adequate 40 or 50 years ago. Education costs were low and there were very few professional or service people who were not paying a fair share of the tax. But in spite of the great changes in our society this archaic tax system has been maintained over the years. School taxes on property should not be drastically reduced or eliminated.

The NDP promised this in their election campaign. We know individual candidates certainly made this promise to reduce the tax, the education mill rate to 25 mills. I give them credit. Perhaps the frontbenchers that are here now honestly thought that there was some chance that this promise would be kept. I am sure that they are badly disillusioned now and I am sure that this is one of the big reasons for the problems that they have had, I understand, in the caucus where some of the backbenchers are insisting that the Premier and the Cabinet do something about this particular promise. They were naïve enough to believe this during the campaign and they are a bit disappointed to find that the Premier has done nothing up to now and has given them no indication that he will ever do anything.

The present Government has certainly taken no steps to implement this promise and no indication that it will ever carry it out.

In the meantime, I should like to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the property owners of Saskatchewan are paying at least \$40 million a year more than they should be for education costs. If the mill rate was reduced to 25 mills even as they had promised, this would take a \$40 million burden off the property owner.

So I call on all Members of this Assembly to urge the NDP Government to take immediate steps to correct this very unjust situation.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, this is one of the NDP promises that was made in the course of the campaign. Of all of the promises that were made some of them were a little grandiose, some of them were a little vaguely worded but here was one that was very simple and very straightforward and one that they sold across the promise and promised from every platform — ‘we’re going to reduce the property tax mill rate to 25 mills’. Here is one, Mr. Speaker, now they are talking about averages, now they are talking about four years and three years. Well, I can tell them, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to have four years to implement this program unless they get busy right now and get it done.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — This was a promise, Mr. Speaker, there was no date line, there was no timetable, it was a straight, simple, straight-out promise to reduce that mill rate to 25 mills. I think the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) has done an excellent job outlining the progress the former Government had made in reducing mill rates across the province. We have had some rather conflicting and disturbing reports, if you like, of late with respect to progress the present Government is making in this regard, Mr. Speaker. Because the Minister hasn’t put the grant estimates before us yet, because we really haven’t seen any new legislation dealing with grants, and because I should like to discuss this a good deal more comprehensively when we get that information, I beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 11 – INCREASE IN INSURANCE RATES**

**Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park)** moved, second by Mr. Guy (Athabasca)

That this Assembly cannot condone that the Minister-in-Charge of SGIO, the Hon. R. Romanow, in announcing the licence insurance rates for Saskatchewan drivers for the year ending March 31, 1973, failed to inform the public that there will be an increase in the rates for 1972 model passenger cars of \$10 and also an increase in the rates of 1972 Class F trucks and Class R trucks of \$5.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, I don’t propose speaking to it at great length because there was considerable debate in the House at the time this subject was before us. But the point that I wish to make, which some could argue was probably adequately made at the time, but I question this, was that the general public looks to the Ministers particularly for credibility and the fact that it took the Hon. Member several days to admit that the earlier statement had been misleading, I think left some question in the minds of the public as to the credibility of the Hon. Attorney General. I think this is regrettable because politicians quite often are accused of not being completely sincere and honest in some of their statements but a Cabinet Minister particularly when reporting a matter of this sort to the House certainly should be factual and if perchance he has been misled by his



department people or has made a mistake then he shouldn't take several days to correct it. He should stand up and admit his mistake because I think that we all recognize that once a person admits his mistake his stature increases. I stated that when the Hon. Attorney General did so a day before this resolution was submitted. Mr. Speaker, I would strongly solicit the support of the House on this resolution. I won't be terribly surprised if I am not heeded in that appeal but I think it would do much to indicate to the public that we expect the Ministers particularly to set a pretty high standard.

**Mr. D.W. Cody (Watrous):** — Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable disappointment that I rise today and it is certainly with considerable disappointment with the Opposition and particularly with the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) that I rise to debate this motion.

In spite of their pronounced limitations on that side of the House, one would have thought they would have had sufficient sense to stop beating a dead horse. Mr. Speaker, it is a grave situation in my mind when the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park seeks what I term cheap political advantage through this kind of a motion. The only thing I can see, Mr. Speaker, is that he hopes to catch the eye of the Press and probably gain for himself a little bit of personal publicity. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that he and his colleagues at this stage of the game certainly would have had enough Press after June 23rd.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, there is very little substance to this resolution, in fact, I am say no substance whatsoever. And I will therefore be moving an amendment at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister-in-Charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office has on several occasions explained his position and explained the position of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office with regard to rates. He has explained in this Assembly and he has explained in Crown Corporations that a new category was added for the rate schedule 1972-73. If you will look at the rate schedule which I am sure you all received with your registration, you will note there is no increase anywhere for vehicles dating back from 1940 to 1971. This rate, Mr. Speaker, is identical to that of last schedule, I should correct myself and say to that of last year. This rate, Mr. Speaker, is identical and will again say is identical to that of last year. There is, however, a new category added to the rate schedule for vehicles year 1972-73. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is an increase and it makes the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park feel good by calling it that, then I certainly hope he feels better for it.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House firmly believe that the no fault concept of automobile insurance in the province has been a great step forward in giving the motoring public relief from the misfortune of tragic accidents. We feel that the increased benefits brought in under Bill 35 the other day will once again update The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. Is this related to the context of the resolution?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I hope that the Member won't start to discuss Bill 35, we have to stay with the resolution, Bill 35 is a debate by itself.

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, I was just merely stating that the benefits brought in under Bill 35, I am not going to debate those benefits. I will say again that the increased benefits brought in through Bill 35 the other day, as I have said before and I make no apologies for it, it was a terrific Bill, once again we will update The Automobile Accident Insurance Act to make it the best and well-received insurance plan on the North American continent. Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention and to that of the Opposition and people of Saskatchewan that we are fortunate that there was a change of Government last June as it is my firm belief that if the Liberals had been returned the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office would have been down the road.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the Member is straying away from the motion. This motion deals with the rate announcements not with Bill 35 of the general insurance. This is dealing with the announcement of rates for cars and I think we have got to keep a little closer to the topic before us.

**Mr. Cody:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will try and keep within the rules as you have stated, however, I would suggest to the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) that if he wants to do any reading he should go out into the lobby where he can do it with a lot of ease. Mr. Speaker, I said before and I feel that it is worth mentioning again, that it is unquestionable that had the Member from Whitmore Park had his want about it . . .

**Mr. Grant:** — On a Point of Order – the Hon. Member is not speaking to the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I don't think the Member is staying close enough to the motion. I believe that anything the Member from Whitmore Park may or may not have done is not embodied in this motion.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, someone said informally that the Member from Whitmore Park didn't do anything, with that I agree. I'm sorry it's not a Point of Order, I'm sorry, I don't want to prolong or to challenge your rulings, Mr. Speaker, but I would submit to you that a Member is entitled to speculate on the motivations for the introduction of any resolution by any other Member and the Member is saying that the Member from Whitmore Park who made the motion respecting SGIO and car rates has certain motivations and he points to the actions of the Member when he was a member of the Treasury Board to show those motivations. I ask you to consider that in this matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the Hon. Member is wishing to tie his remarks into this motion, I think that he should give the House information to show how he is tying it in because I am at a lose to try to follow how he is tying it in.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. If he is going to bring in Government Insurance, you know I am going to have a long speech on this and I want the same kind of treatment from the Chair as the Attorney General wants you to make. You have made a ruling and I want to congratulate you on that ruling. He has no business discussing it if he can't read and he is an insurance man, I hope he is educated, he doesn't show it. I hope he will read the resolution and it states very simply what the Member from Whitmore Park wanted. If he wants to move an amendment then we will talk on the amendment but surely he is not going to roam all over telling this House that if we were re-elected we would sell SGIO.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I may say for the guidance of all Members that the Member for Watrous said he was going to introduce an amendment, the Chair has no knowledge what it is. Sometimes remarks being made by a Member may be tying into their amendment but if that is the case then they must advise the House of what they are going to move first, otherwise, the Chair can only rule on what is before it.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, he did say, maybe you haven't heard or didn't hear him, but he did say he was going to amend this motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He said he was going to amend it but the Chair has no knowledge. His context may tie in with his amendment. If he would make the House acquainted with what his amendment is going to be before he moves it then the House would know it's in order. At the present time I think he is straying too far from it.

**Mr. Cody:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you wish I can read a portion of this amendment and possibly then you can allow me to carry on if you wish. The amendment in substance says that we support the principle of compulsory no fault government operated automobile insurance. It also says that because of the provided wide benefits to our people involved in car accidents, extremely low rates of insurance as evidenced by the announcement of the Minister the other day and this in essence is what the amendment will be all about. And that is the reason partly why I was delving into these areas and I think to make my point I had to. I had to state the comments with regard to the Member from Whitmore Park.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I wonder if I might have a copy of that since he is going to speak to it. I wonder if we could just have a copy of his motion at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think he hasn't yet moved it and I realize that Members cannot get copies of it because the Chair doesn't have a copy of it. For the benefit of the House, I should just ask him if he would indicate what line the amendment may be along because I have no knowledge as to whether the amendment will or will not be in order until it is submitted to the Chair. All he has tried to outline for the benefit of Members is what his motion will embody.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to add one more Point of Order. I fail to see what compulsory no fault insurance has to do with the Member for Whitmore Park.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have an additional Point of Order arising out of my original comments. He says that he intends to move an amendment and he gives the general purport of the amendment but he then proposes to speak to the purported amendment without presenting it to us and surely he is not entitled to speak to something that isn't before the House just because he says that at some future time he will bring it to the House. I think that until he presents a copy of the amendment, he is not authorized or entitled to speak to what is a mythical amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — This does leave a fine line all right. On numerous occasions in the past it has been that Members will signify the intent to move an amendment so that it will show that they intend to go farther afield. Once any Member moves an amendment as submitted to the Chair, then he has finished speaking and he has lost his right to speak because he has moved his amendment once the amendment comes up. I realize it is difficult to read the amendment but what the Member could do for courtesy's sake if he wished would be to send a copy of the proposed amendment across to other Members who are interested. The rules do not demand it and he must move his amendment before he sits down. But as a courtesy to give Members extra information, that could be done if he so wished.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order. I would offer a suggestion that the Member opposite from Watrous read the amendment he has on the presumption that when he concludes his remarks he moves the amendment. That way he won't lose his place to speak, we'll know what the amendment is, he can send us a copy. If he will tell us what the amendment is during the course of his remark and move it when he concludes his speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is what I suggested he could do and he has made known the general tenor of his amendment. I said he could out of courtesy send a copy to the other Members but he wouldn't then be officially moving his amendment to bar him from speaking.

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, if I could interject for the edification of some of us new Members. The impression that I got from the proposed amendment, it seems to be a totally different subject matter. I am just raising the question, Mr. Speaker, what the rules are on that.

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word or two to the Point of Order. It would appear to me that the Opposition are very much afraid of what I might be saying here that is going to tap them on their little eyeballs or something. Is that what you are afraid of?

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, Point of Order. Now that's the kind of nonsense we shouldn't have around here. What he is suggesting

to us is that he is not going to tell us what he is going to speak about but he is telling us that what he is speaking about (although not to the resolution) is to something that he will tell us about later. Now, that has got to be nonsense. Obviously he is not going to extend to us the courtesy that you suggested.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think we are getting away from the debate. The Hon. Member hasn't had time yet to say whether he is going to follow my suggestion or not since I said that that could be done. Maybe the Hon. Member has got an additional copy he can send to the leader of your group.

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, I have an additional copy here and if they would like to have it they are certainly welcome to it. However, I am going to continue speaking and there is no question in my mind about that.

Mr. Speaker, leaving off where I was so rudely interrupted by the Opposition. As I was saying, I should like to draw to your attention and in particular to the Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan, as I said before, that we are certainly fortunate that we did win the last election because there is little question in my mind that the Government Insurance Office would have been sold. We know, Mr. Speaker, that there was a study done. We know that the Members on the other side of the House were not in favor of compulsory insurance, barring one or two.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I straightened that out yesterday with the Hon. Member. He is making an accusation in this House that is not correct. I stood up in this House yesterday and expressed my views on compulsory automobile insurance. It's on the record, you just read it.

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, I heard the Hon. Member yesterday as well and I know what he said but I also know what he said in Crown Corporations two or three days ago. When the very question was asked from the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! What takes place in Crown Corporations cannot be discussed by either side until the committee reports to this Legislature. What goes on there is not available for the discussions here.

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, I am still convinced as I was before that there is little question in my mind that had the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park been the Minister in Charge of this corporation, it certainly would have gone down the road.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — I think that really there is more than one motive for this kind of a resolution. As I said at the outset, unfounded resolution, unfounded motion. I think it was just a matter of the Hon. Member wanting to discredit the Minister-in-Charge of the Saskatchewan Government Office and

possibly, if you want to say, even worse than that, discredit The Automobile Insurance Act so that the people of Saskatchewan would lose confidence in this Act. They have tried to discredit this plan for the last seven years by having no increased benefits, by every kind of motivation that you can think of. Mr. Speaker, the plan has not been updated by one degree in the last seven years. I feel that for that reason and for that reason alone we can say that The Automobile Insurance Act was pretty well down the road.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What is your Point of Order?

**Mr. MacLeod:** — The Point of Order is this. I have read the motion as presented to me by the Hon. Member, his motion amending Resolution No. 11. Quite frankly, the motion as he proposes it is entirely different from what the original motion was. The point I propose . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I should like to advise all Hon. Members that the advance copy was sent across for guidance of other Members if they wished to see one. We cannot debate the amendment before it is moved. The Chair may or may not rule it out of order, I don't know, because I haven't seen it because it is not yet moved in the House. I hope Members will bear with me until I get the amendment and Members will be permitted then to speak against it if they wish.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, if you profess not to know what the amendment is going to be then keep him on this motion. You have heard him stray all over Government Insurance. You let him go by and yet you profess you are innocent. You are not innocent, you are letting him speak on something that is not before the House.

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, if I may. I extended a courtesy to the Hon. Member for Albert Park by giving him a copy of my amendment. That's exactly what the Opposition asked for. I extended that courtesy to them and after he read it he comes up with a Point of Order saying this amendment will not be in order. What more do those people want?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! An amendment may be offered to a motion which draws an opposite conclusion from the original motion, then the two are debatable at the same time. Then the House has the right to decide which way it wants to make a decision. On the other hand if amendment is made to a motion which is just changing a few words but not the substance of the motion then the debate must continue strictly on the amendment because it is either just adding to or deleting. But if an amendment is made which as I mentioned makes an alternative decision of the House both are debatable at the same time. I think for the benefit of the House I ask him to give us a little bit of the outline of his amendment but I didn't ask him for the wording because once he submits the wording to the Chair then he has lost his right to speak. I hope that we can proceed without due difficulty

and the Members will have a full chance to answer.

**Mr. Cody:** — If I may just carry on I am going to only be another moment because it seems that I have hit on some pretty tender feet here today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — It seems that when people get into the Opposition and get a little older, I guess you might term it or whatever you want to say, and letter a little on the reactionary side, they get sort of sensitive, quite sensitive to this kind of thing. As a result there is not much point in prolonging the debate any longer because obviously they are not going to give one an opportunity to carry on.

Let me say again then, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the former Liberal Government has in my mind discredited The Automobile Accident Insurance Act over the past seven years. I can assure them that we on this side of the House will instill confidence in the people of Saskatchewan regarding this plan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, with those few words, badly interrupted, it gives me a great deal of pleasure in moving the following amendment, seconded by my colleague from Arm River (Mr. Faris),

That all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Supports the principle of compulsory, no-fault, government-operated, automobile insurance, administered in Saskatchewan by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, because it has provided wide benefits to our people involved in car accidents at extremely low rates of insurance as evidenced by the recent announcement by the Minister in Charge of SGIO, the Hon. Roy Romanow, respecting the rates for the licence year 1972-73.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before I put this motion to the House, I should like to read to the House from page 170 of Beauchesne and 202(13). It says,

An amendment to alter the main question by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

I should like to say that this amendment that has been moved by the Member for Watrous, seconded by the Member for Arm River, being somewhat of an alternate conclusion, I find the amendment in order and the debate continues concurrently on both.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may on a Point of Privilege. I'll have to ask your answer on this because I am not sure whether there is a Point of Privilege or not. The Hon. Member made a statement about myself and I took exception to it. I suggest

that if he read the Hansard yesterday he would see that his statement was not correct. My point of enquiry is, may I have the privilege at this time of correcting the Hon. Member in this regard?

**Mr. Speaker:** — If a member feels that he has been misquoted during a speech of another Member then the proper time is at the conclusion of that Member's speech, to rise at that time and make the correction without making it prerogative to state what they believe the facts. The House should accept any Member's statement as being the true statement of the Member. You would have the right to correct his statement without expanding on the statement.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, I find that the Hon. Member was absent from the House yesterday and this may be some justification for his misunderstanding, but I'll refresh his memory and the memory of others on what I actually said. I am quoting from the debate in connection with The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. I am quoting myself,

I don't think he can find anything in the records of this House in the past seven years where I have criticized The Automobile Accident Insurance Act with the possible exception of one clause in it.

Then I went on to explain the compulsory collision part of it,

I don't think there is anybody in Saskatchewan including the insurance agents working for the private sector who criticize the compulsory feature as far as third party liability is concerned. I don't think there is any insurance agent who will even try to defend the position that private operators could do equally well or better because, first of all, it is done under the Act, there is no acquisition costs, there is no policy to be issued. I don't think it would be practical under the private sector. It seems to me because of my basic argument, that government is justified in getting into business where there is a lack of competition or failure on the part of the public or private sector to perform, that they were justified in getting into this area of third party liability.

Then I went on to express my opposition to the question of collision coverage.

**Mr. Cody:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not quote from any document.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We can't enter debate on it. You made certain comments which you believe to be true and the Member for Whitmore Park is trying to put on the record his stand on it and I think that ends the debate on that part of it.

What is before us now is the original motion and the amendment.



**Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief remarks on this particular motion. Certainly I am sure it is a matter of regret to me and I know regret to other Members on this side and both sides of the House, Mr. Speaker, that such a motion had to be made in the first instance. I am sure this was pointed out by the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) who moved the motion. The motion reads, Mr. Speaker, that this Assembly cannot condone the Minister-in-Charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) in announcing the licence rates for Saskatchewan drivers for the year ending March 31st and failed to inform the public that there would be an increase in rates for 1972 model passenger cars of \$10 and an increase in rates of Class F and R trucks of \$5. As I say, it is a matter of extreme regret that such a motion had to be put on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, Certainly the credibility of Government and the credibility of the various Cabinet Ministers is a very vital issue to this House and to this Chamber and the Government of the Province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Now, when you listen to the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) in his very good fashion really get up making some stormy comments and try and becloud the issue completely by bringing in a motion that completely emasculates the original motion of the Member for Whitmore Park and trying to obliterate the issue. I regret that he had done so and that this motion couldn't have been disposed of in the normal manner. Mr. Speaker, as I say, I regret very much that this motion has had to be brought in. I trust as the Session develops that the Attorney General develops the kind of maturity that is required to be a Minister and remembers that he is, in fact, in Government, his statements must be factual statements and not given to the fantasy that he was so used to in Opposition and of course, if my good friend the Attorney General would come around to this attitude this kind of motion wouldn't have been necessary in the first place.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words regarding this motion and the amendment. I find that the amendment is in keeping with what I believe in and I will support the amendment. But as the Member for Wilkie has indicated, the reason for this motion appearing on the Order Paper was because of a misinformer coming into this House and informing us that there was no increase in rates for the 1972-73 year. On three occasions he tried to tell us that there was no change in rates and then finally he told us there was in fact an increase. The Attorney General who believes in honesty and human rights, why would he want to misinform the public? We certainly need an Ombudsman for the Attorney General, to keep track of him so that he doesn't go around misinforming the public.

The Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) and the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) spoke exhibiting the bitter attitude they were taking. They have won an election and when we criticize them or when we bring in a motion they talk about 'we've been in battle, we're going to battle'. Yes, the NDP they go to battle. The Liberals, they fight an election but the NDP by the kind of campaign they're conducting, they are armed with

the ammunition, with all the lies that they can garner up to misinform the public. Here again, the Attorney General tried to misinform, deliberately tried to misinform the public. And this is why the resolution has appeared on the Order Paper. As I said, I will support the amendment. The Opposition is not opposed to the principle of compulsory Government insurance in the automobile field.

**Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Rosthern usually starts his debate, I didn't intend to get into this debate but I feel I must.

Some of them are still smarting I think from previous things that occurred.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this House I feel somewhat disillusioned with what happens in this House. I think this is another example of what I was referring to previously. Certainly 60 Members in this House can find better things to discuss than simply a tactic or a method that was used in explaining Government insurance. If I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the House in the past when I was not a Member, the Members opposite used exactly the same procedures that were used in introducing a rate for car insurance and licence rates. I don't think that the Attorney General would go before this House on such a small issue and deceive this House. I don't think he would do that. He wouldn't do that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members opposite are grabbing at straws to try and discredit this Government. They are trying to do anything to make a comeback from the defeat that they received last June 23rd.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Maybe it is true, Mr. Speaker, as the Member from Watrous has indicated that had they formed the Government SGIO would have been sold. I'm not sure whether the allegations are true or not but he alleges they are. But certainly we know their stand, we know that they thought of SGIO, we know what they think of certain other Crown corporations that have been established.

That's all I want to say, Mr. Speaker. Surely to goodness we've got more important issues to discuss than to spend our time for an hour or an hour and a half on a very small, little thing. Let's get on with the business of governing, rather than trying to see if we can't make some political hay on a small, little issue. And I would hope that that would be the end of this particular issue.

**Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak to this one either but it does seem that the debate has taken rather an interesting turn.

We started out by condemning the Hon. Attorney General for what was a bit of misinformation which he presented to us on three different occasions. It now seems that the debate has turned to decide whether this is a big enough lie to be worthy of the Attorney General.

**Mr. Romanow:** — I wonder if the Hon. Member is saying that I lied?

**Mr. MacLeod:** — No, I'm not saying that at all. I merely am examining the . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think the imputation was in the speaker's comments and I think he should withdraw those remarks from the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — I certainly am not saying that the Hon. Attorney General lied to the House but we are saying that he failed to inform the public that there would be an increase in the rates for 1972 model passenger cars of \$10 and also an increase in the rates of 1972 Class F trucks and Class R trucks of \$5. We are saying by the resolution that he failed to do these things.

As I understand the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) he is measuring the size of misinformation and he seems to indicate to us that this is too small a thing for the Attorney General to lie about, that it would be a matter far larger that would cause him to lie and that that's the kind of thing we should look out for. And I say that this is just as big and important . . .

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Personal privilege, please. If the Member is indicating I said that if the Attorney General would lie on a bigger issue, I would take exception to that statement. I did not infer that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, that is the point of issue because to us misinformation does not come in sizes. We are very disturbed over the import of the remarks of the Hon. Member for Nutana South and we are equally disturbed at the failure of the Attorney General as indicated in the original motion, Resolution No. 11.

**Mr. E.L. Cowley (Biggar):** — I'm the third one in a row that didn't intend to enter this debate. The debate really centres around a question of semantics as to what the interpretation is of what was an increase and what wasn't an increase, and what is a new rate, and is that an increase or not. And that basically is the argument that took place back and forth across the floor a couple of weeks ago when this matter was raised. All I can do is question 'why' the Members opposite have seen fit to put this into a resolution. It's for one of two reasons, Mr. Speaker. It appears to me it's got to be either because they think they can make some political hay out of it or some reason that I can't figure out. I can only assume that it's the first one because it doesn't appear to me to be anything else. It's a question of semantics and the big lie thing is another question of semantics, as to how one interprets someone's statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Members can deal with this matter expeditiously and quickly and get it off the Order Paper.

**Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park):** — I have to take exception to a statement by my colleague and I am sure I may be the only one on this side of the House who feels that he can't support the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Is the Member speaking just to the amendment or are you attempting to close the debate now?

**Mr. Grant:** — No, I'm speaking to the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member has the right to speak to the amendment but you would not be closing the debate at this time. That's what I want to make sure.

**Mr. Grant:** — Oh, I wouldn't think of doing that. Please stop me if I wander, but I'm going to try to stick to the amendment.

I think it's regrettable really that I can't support the amendment and in light of what I said yesterday I don't see how the Hon. Member from Watrous (Mr. Cody) could expect me to support this amendment because it's asking me to endorse the compulsory no-fault Government operated insurance scheme which, as I indicated when I read my remarks of yesterday, I have a reservation. After listening to the Hon. Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley) yesterday I have a still larger reservation because the point I made yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was that while I could justify compulsory third party liability insurance for the protection of others and the protection of their property, by no stretch of the imagination was I able to justify the Government compelling me and the other citizens of Saskatchewan to buy collision insurance which in no way whatsoever had any bearing on the safety or welfare of third party people either in the area of bodily injury or property damage.

The Hon. Member from Biggar is commenting about my point left no doubt in my mind that because of his thinking and because of philosophical grounds and the saving that might be made, that this is justified. He's entitled to that opinion. I would suggest that he suddenly joined the ranks of the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) because I would say that this fits in very well with the philosophy of the Wafflers and they are quite entitled to this philosophy too. Just because I disagree with it, I'm not going to harangue that point today, but he compared by point to that of Medicare, that if you carry it to that ridiculous point, I wouldn't be in favor of Medicare. I don't think this is a fair comparison whatsoever. There's no similarity at all and I still maintain that my comparison was far better. If you are going to compel a person to buy collision insurance on their vehicles then the next logical step is to compel them to buy fire insurance on their houses. I think this is a far better comparison than comparing it to Medicare because you can at least see the limitation of your exposure as far as collision and your household insurance is concerned. You certainly can't see any limitation on your exposure as far as medical expenses are concerned. So I don't think that comparison is correct.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that while it has been indicated that the Opposition will support the amendment, in view of my basic philosophy or whatever you want to call it, or belief that the Government shouldn't compel me to insure my property for my own protection, I find it necessary to abstain from voting because I support part of the motion but I can't honestly in clear conscience support it holus-bolus.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS – 56**

Messieurs

Blakeney	Dyck	Meakes
Wood	Smishek	Romanow
Messer	Snyder	Kramer
Thibault	Larson	Kowalchuk
Baker	Brockelbank	MacMurchy
Pepper	Michayluk	Byers
Thorson	Kwasnica	Carlson
Engel	Tchorzewski	Richards
Owens	Robbins	Matsalla
Cowley	Taylor	Faris
Cody	Gross	Feduniak
Mostoway	Comer	Rolfes
Lange	Hanson	Oliver
Feschuk	Kaeding	Flasch
Steuart	Coupland	Loken
Guy	Boldt	MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac	Gardner	Weatherald
MacLeod	McPherson	Lane
MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)	Wiebe	

**NAYS – 0**

Messieurs

Nil

Motion as amended agreed to.

**RESOLUTION NO. 12 – MANDATORY HEARINGS PROPOSED BEFORE LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE**

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington)** moved, seconded by Mr. Gardner (Moosomin):

That this Assembly recommend to the Government of Saskatchewan that legislation be proposed to ensure that provision is made for mandatory public hearings before any major environmental change is made in which the Government participates or for which Crown lands or Crown permits are required.

He said: On rising to move this motion which I will be moving at the conclusion of my remarks, I should like to refresh the Assembly's memory in regard to the resolution which is on the Order Paper. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many people in our society in all stations of life and of all ages who are showing a great deal of concern over what I would put into these categories, (1) the preservation of renewable natural resources, (2) pollution, and (3) the

environment. The people who exhibit concern over these particular aspects of our society want to have a method by which they may participate in decisions that are being made by both industry and government. There are many new citizen groups that have sprung up around our country in the last two or three years and throughout our province and in very recent times they have become both active and very knowledgeable in these subjects. These interested conservationists and individual people find that too often the damage is done to the environment before they have an opportunity for discussion. Governmental agencies and companies frequently are well under way with both plans and work before the general public or individuals know of these plans and intentions. There are many projects involving mining, clearing of trees and drainage which would fit this description. What I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is not a system which would remove decision making from governments or unduly delay worthwhile projects, I simply suggest that public hearings should be advertised and held so that individuals and conservation groups have an opportunity to put forth their views.

Recently there have been a number of exact examples of how this actually would take place. The Alaskan pipeline is the most noteworthy example. Except for a law which existed in Alaska which allowed conservation groups to present their case the Alaskan pipeline now would in all likelihood be actually built. The result of such law, however, has permitted conservation groups to hold up the building of the pipeline and the resulting further investigation has presented much more information as far as the value and the preservation of the environment is concerned. Of course, in this particular instance the latest information exhibits the McKenzie Valley pipeline would be the safest method of transporting oil from that part of the world to the markets and that actually it will present a more favorable way in regard to preserving the environment in doing so, Mr. Speaker. This is a typical example of how, I think, a law such as this would be of benefit to the Province of Saskatchewan.

I realize that in all likelihood a number of speakers on the opposite side will spring to their feet and suggest that why didn't we on this side actually put such a law into operation. Well, I would suggest to those who are likely to do so, Mr. Speaker, that I know of no province in Canada which has a similar type of law in existence, although I could be wrong on this count. But there are none which comes to my mind. I think if Saskatchewan leads the way in this regard this it could be of substantial benefit and would be the first such move in Canada. I think it is very necessary when I take a look at many parts of Saskatchewan where disfigurement of the countryside has taken place and could have been avoided if the public and various interested groups had had an opportunity to sit down and discuss and make their views known to the various Government agencies or the Government itself.

I realize that there is a substantial number of people within the confines of Government who would say that this would reduce the decision-making process. I look at it from a much different point of view, Mr. Speaker. I think that what it would do is require governmental agencies and people who work for such organizations as PFRA, Conservation and Development Authority and others, that it would require that they be much more careful in their plans and in their decision-making process.

These conservation groups are anxious to participate before projects are undertaken. They are anxious to put forward their case, they are anxious to have an opportunity to discuss with the agency and the Government what is actually going to take place.

I should like to express my point of view that it should not in any way influence a person's own private property. I would not anticipate such a public hearing to involve a person who is a farmer and is making some changes in his landscape on his own particular farm. I don't think that there should be interference in this regard as to what a farmer may do with his own particular land. But I do think that when mining projects are started, community pastures are started, when coal mining operations are an example, a pulp mill is an example. I do think that in most cases where permits are required from the Government and for an industry, or are required for the Government itself through one of its agencies to undertake a massive change, that there is a very drastic need for public advertisement of such intention to take place. This public advertisement will be statutory law which would require that the project would be well advertised, a public hearing be held and that the people who are interested to gain information can serve not only as a method by which the individual can gain information, it can serve as a way in which the individual can make his input into the final decision which would be arrived at by the Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that although this, to my knowledge, has not yet been tried in this country, that it is urgent and desirable and I believe it would rate high amongst public priorities which are required to be served in our province. It will require, of course, the co-operation of the public itself, the Government and industry. I think that rather than being a hindrance it can provide the necessary information for more and better answers before most projects are undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned when I began my remarks I did suggest that there would be and likely will be the cry from Members opposite that this law should have been passed. Pollution and the environment is a relatively new subject in Canada. It has never really received any great amount of public debate probably until the last two or three years so I think rather than looking at the point of view that we are behind in this regard, I think we have an opportunity to be ahead in this regard, although I realize the law would have been to advantage in the past, previous to now. I do suggest for serious consideration that such a law would have wide merit and would have substantial public support.

I therefore move this resolution, seconded by the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner).

**Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I thin it is well known that I have a great interest in the wildlife of the province and that I made a major speech here sometime ago on it. Certainly the environment is very closely related to the preservation of wildlife in the province. The hearings that were suggested in this resolution would be essential if we are to preserve the wildlife which is our natural heritage. I have some more remarks to make on this subject and I should like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**RESOLUTION NO. 7 – BASIC HEARING AID TO BE INCLUDED IN MEDICAL INSURANCE PLAN**

**Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park)** moved, seconded by Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that action be taken immediately to broaden the coverage of the Saskatchewan Medical Insurance Plan to include a basic hearing aid, without cost, for the hard of hearing.

He said:

This resolution relates to the provision of free hearing aids for the hard of hearing in Saskatchewan. I think this is a very meaningful way in which the Government can demonstrate its good faith in terms of health services for Saskatchewan people. I think this is one way in which the Government could give an indication that it in reality believes in providing a wide range of health services for Saskatchewan people. It is a program which in present day terms, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, would not be regarded as an exceptionally expensive program but one that I know would be valuable to many of the senior citizens whom I am in contact with on a day to day basis.

People with hearing defects are shut off, Mr. Speaker, from the world. In the young people it leads to many other problems, speech defects, education problems, personality and social problems and job problems. In the elderly people with advancing age they are increasingly shut off from the world, a separate and distinct problem of their own. We must not delay. With them the pity is that in the eventide of life they need the services not tomorrow but today.

It therefore, Mr. Speaker, gives me great pleasure to move the resolution which I believe will be supported by all Members of the House particularly those who recognize the words that I have used because I believe if they were to check Hansard they would find that I have used identical words of Members opposite in previous debates. I am, therefore, pleased to move this resolution.

**Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful that the Hon. Member has brought to the attention of the House the question of the problems of the hard of hearing. As the Member said in his opening remarks, the actual wording of his motion was almost identical with the wording that we, on this side of the House, used in a motion in 1970. That we, the NDP, moved the motion and then debate continuing it was moved by the Hon. Mr. Grant, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Heald in an amendment thereto:

That all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

This Assembly requests the Government of Saskatchewan when considering extension of services under The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act and having regard to other priorities, to consider also the inclusion of hearing aids as an insured service. However, this Assembly recommends that prior to such consideration



being given the Government give careful study to the report of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs Sub-committee on hearing aids.

Mr. Speaker, sanctimonious twaddle. What the Members opposite proceed to do was to amend any urgency out of the resolution and to imply this was not a priority matter. And, of course, the Members opposite proceeded to do nothing in the remaining months of their office. In fact, there are relatively minor expenditures that I understand were requested by members of the Health Department to test a couple of hearing aids to which they had got access. This was considered of such negligible importance that the requisite \$150 to conduct the tests was not allocated. And thus we arrive in March of 1972 and that we have quoted back to us in a very elegant game the precise words that we in the New Democratic Party used two years ago on this very issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate that we consider what in fact has the Government done to date on the issue. We have before us the complete blank of what the opposite Members have done. What we have done — we have already begun to estimate the need and I agree with the Hon. Member that there is an acute need. We have estimates of up to 33.8 per 1,000 having some degree of hearing loss. That would amount to in the order of 25,000 to 30,000 people in the province. There are approximately 2,000 hearing aids sold annually in the province but a great many more would be sold were the cost lower. We have begun negotiations with interested parties towards the achievement of the program and now we are preparing and we hope to introduce within this year a program to implement the promise that we made last June to the electors of Saskatchewan to provide hearing aids at greatly reduced costs.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Richards:** — We have already received 12 hearing aids which have been tested, three of which were found to be inferior, none of which are of acceptable quality. The average cost per hearing aid, Mr. Speaker, on our receipt for bulk tendering is \$35 which compares to prices well over \$300 which people are very often paying at the retail level for hearing aids. These hearing aids are good quality hearing aids according to reports from the National Research Council. I quote,

We have tested around 200 models of hearing aids. The models that you

That is the Saskatchewan Government,

sent for testing compare quite favorably with the average aid.

They include pocket or on the body, over and behind the ear, in the ear and eye glass hearing aids, so there will be no criticism from the Members opposite to the effect that we are having nothing but big boxes to shove in your shirt and that we are not prepared to consider the cosmetic aspect. We have done our homework, Mr. Speaker. We have got those quotations and are prepared ultimately even if the consumer had to pay all administration costs and all service costs we could sell hearing aids with the province, according to the feasibility

study we have done, for less than \$100.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I think that this is one more area where we as Members of the New Democratic Party in power are prepared to use the Government as a public entrepreneur on behalf of the problems of the ordinary people of Saskatchewan. That we are prepared not to use the power of the Government to subsidize huge corporate investments, not to wield the heavy axe over people, but we are prepared to use the power of the Government on behalf of the people, to challenge powers which set ridiculous prices that allow for exorbitant profits on hearing appliances.

I think it does well become the Members opposite now that they are in Opposition to assume this sanctimonious position with respect to hearing aids, that to assume this position on a basis when they had seven years in office in which to do something to reduce the cost of hearing aids and now it gets thrown back in a nice little question of having dug up our former words. We have made our commitments, we will live up to our commitments and to that effect I should like to move the following amendment, Mr. Speaker,

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

- (a) regrets that the previous Government did not develop a program or initiate any action which would reduce the price of hearing aids to the consumer even though they were aware that a large number of hard of hearing citizens were being denied the right to achieve improved hearing because they were unable to pay the exorbitant price for a hearing aid while others were purchasing hearing aids at great personal sacrifice and
- (b) commends the Government of Saskatchewan for establishing a special committee to inquire into this situation and recommends to the Government a program which will allow hard of hearing citizens to obtain quality hearing aid appliances at greatly reduced cost.

I move this seconded by the Hon. Mr. Gross, the Member for Gravelbourg.

**Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General):** It gives me a great deal of pleasure to get up and say a few words in support of the amendment and in support of the action taken by the Government to date. This is supplementary to the comments made by my colleague from Saskatoon University, Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) whom I know is doing an excellent job in that capacity of assisting the Minister.

I also want to say to the Members of the House that I recall when I was a Member of the Opposition that this is a resolution that on at least several occasions was introduced by my colleague, the now Minister of Welfare (Mr. Snyder) when he was in Opposition and at times, as well, by my colleague the Minister of Health. Year after year the motion that we presented, that one that is the subject of the main motion now by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), was debated by the Members of the New Democratic Party who were in Opposition. There may have been one or two words spoken by Government Members at the time. I stand

to be corrected by the Debates and Proceedings but if there were any in my recollection, Mr. Speaker, they were precious few. Apart from the lack of words spoken in support of the resolution, what is of more concern to me was that for seven years the former Government saw fit to do absolutely nothing about the subject matter which is now before you on the main motion.

What rather the former Government sought to do was to make amendments. May I just draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment which was introduced in the last Debates and Proceedings of 1970 requesting the Government of Saskatchewan to take into consideration what the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs had to say about hearing aids. The debate continued, the amendment was passed, the main motion was negatived and that's where it sat in 1970. So what the Liberal Party has done, being devoid of ideas itself in 1971 and 1972, is to go back to the Journals. I think they have done this primarily with most of the questions they have asked as well, Mr. Speaker, and most of the other motions that are before this House. They have gone back to the old Journals to see what the NDP Opposition did. They ferret out the wording of the motion at that time and put it back before the House. They honestly expect Members of this Assembly and the public to ask of a new Government eight months after assuming office that it implement the substance of the resolution. I think very often today we hear about credibility and honesty in politicians, very often we hear statements about how important it is for politicians to act and to speak with consistency and not to misrepresent. Very often we hear Members lecturing other Members on what conduct and what statements should be made. Unfortunately every time that I have been in the House the lecture comes from the Members of the Liberal Party. They lecture and talk in one way but as this resolution shows, they act in a totally different way when it comes to the interest of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — I say the motion from the Members for Albert Park is sheer and pure hypocrisy of the lowest kind. It is hypocritical, it is unfair because it plays games, political games, with those who have, in fact, been victimized on what the substance matter of the motion seeks to resolve. The Member from Albert Park, in my estimation, is very prone, and I think that is regrettable as a new Member, very prone to get up and introduce simply by way of reversal, motions of this nature or speeches to ask by way of reversal motions, the new Government of the day within eight months of implement measures. I think this is regrettable because as a new Member he has a positive contribution to make. I am going to lecture for a few minutes, if I may. He has a positive contribution to make on issues, on the policies of the Liberal Party. Not merely on turning the tables so that one cheap, political trick can be taken or a cheap political headline can be grabbed. And I commend to the Hon. Member from Albert Park and to the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) who was on Treasury Bench at that time, and to every Member on the opposite side, the thought that the people of Saskatchewan will only have confidence in you when you begin to realize and to show to them that you have a thought-out position and that you are going to carry through on what you say you are going to do. Not until such time, Mr. Speaker, will they do it. I want to say that I am very, very happy indeed that the Member from Saskatoon

University (Mr. Richards) has explained to this House, to the Members of this House exactly what the facts are by introducing this amendment, that he explained to the people of Saskatchewan that it was the former Government that apparently did nothing or little with regard to examining the situation. I want to say that the Government and the Minister of Health should be indeed commended for getting this project on the way so quickly because I am sure that, in fact, very soon we will remedy the iniquity that all of us on this side of the House now profess we oppose. I am certainly going to support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise too to participate in this debate. When one looks at the resolution one cannot really oppose the resolution as such. But also when one listens to the Member from University (Mr. Richards) and finds that a similar motion was passed almost two years ago, one regrets the fact that action was not taken at that time. Again, I think it is evident that this Government intends to carry out the promises it made in June of 1971. We have been in office for only eight or nine months and already we have done much, much more than the Liberals did in seven years. Mr. Speaker, I have many more things that I would like to say about this particular topic and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 8 – MATERNITY LEAVE IN LABOUR STANDARDS ACT**

**Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park)** moved, second by Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview):

That this Assembly congratulates the Federal Government for including provision in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code for maternity leave for employed women and their reinstatement at the expiration of such leave, and requests that the Government of Saskatchewan bring similar legislation to this Assembly at the earliest opportunity.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for an amendment to Saskatchewan's Labour Standards Act to provide for maternity leave along the lines provided by Federal legislation. I might remind the Members across the way that it is a Liberal Government in Ottawa that has provided this type of legislation and I make no apologies for the fact that if an idea is good I am quite prepared to recommend it to this House.

The Canada Labour Standards Act provides for maternity leave up to eleven weeks or a period of six weeks following confinement and reinstatement in the position occupied at the time such leave commenced or in a comparable position with not less than the same wages and benefits. Women would qualify for this type of leave after they have been employed with a particular employer for one year or more. They would be obliged to submit a medical certificate when they make application to leave.

Now I'm not asking for identical legislation. What I am asking for is similar legislation and I will be quite prepared

to support any reasonable variation. I am sure that women in Saskatchewan's labor force will be delighted to receive this kind of relief and assurance and safety protecting them for a return to their employment when they become pregnant during the time they are employed. I hope prompt action will be taken on this resolution and I do call on all Members regardless of party affiliation to support the resolution. In addition I plan to bring this before the fall convention of our Party and I have no doubt that our Party will consider this and other labor matters to establish a Liberal labor code.

Mr. Speaker, I now move this resolution.

**Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate on Resolution No. 8, I should like to say first of all what a very pleasant surprise it is to find that the Hon. Member from Regina Albert Park has seen fit to join the Government in voicing concern for our female members of the labor force. I think one is inclined to feel some sympathy for the Member over his apparent inability to convince some of his colleagues while they were in office to take some kind of concrete action to promote the best interest of working women through the introduction of legislation which he is now proposing in this House. It seems legitimate, Mr. Speaker, to ask why statutory provisions for maternity leave were not enacted during the period 1964 to 1971. I can assure the mover of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that he is not likely to find an argument on this side of the House against the need for maternity leave protection.

In all fairness, it would be pointed out, however, that we were handed the reins of Government only eight months ago as was mentioned in the previous debate and it is physically impossible to achieve more than so much in such a short span of time, particularly in view of the multiplicity of urgent matters which have been competing for attention over that eight months. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is rather refreshing to receive the kind of suggestions contained in this resolution in as much as speaker after speaker across the way has been complaining for days that in terms of the labor policy of this Government that the Government has indeed been moving ahead quickly. Moreover, when it comes to programs dealing with the working women, the Government has no intention of adopting a hastily conceived, stop-gap measure which will come to grips with only part of a much broader issue. It will be widely recognized, Mr. Speaker, that the basis of this resolution is a valid one. However, the growing contribution of female wage earners to the advancement of the economy is of such significance that the Government believes that any legislative action should be proceeded by comprehensive investigation directed towards the obtaining of an overview of the difficulties confronting the employed women.

As I mentioned in this Assembly a short while ago the New Democratic Government took steps to establish a Women's Bureau in the Department of Labour in early 1964. The activities of the Bureau were directed towards the evaluation of legislation and working conditions of special importance to women in the labor force. Not only was the Bureau not given the resources to properly carry out this function by a previous Liberal Government but it was not permitted to become involved in any consideration of new policy relative to the particular interests

of employed women. As indicated previously, Mr. Speaker, this situation is changing. The Women's Bureau will play an important part in the study referred to. An assessment of the needs of female employees with family responsibilities will be made by the Bureau with specific reference to the question of maternity leave.

Some attention should be focused at this point, I believe, Mr. Speaker, on the question of priorities. The Government felt that the most immediate action should be taken to prohibit, in law, discrimination on the basis of sex. Accordingly, a Bill is currently before the Legislature to protect the rights of women to obtain employment and to be subject to fair employment practices. It would appear to be logical to expect that the opportunity for a woman to secure a job is a prerequisite to her arranging for leave from that job for the purposes of maternity. Coinciding with the introduction of the amendment to The Fair Employment Practices Act are the proposed changes to the Bill of Rights in The Fair Accommodation Practices Act in order to deal with a broader spectrum of obstacles often faced by women in the work place and elsewhere. The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission is also proposed, Mr. Speaker, to actively advance and to promote the principle of human dignity and freedom. An on-going system of consultation will be arranged between the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour and the Commission in order to co-ordinate the efforts of the two agencies in coping with the problems of working women.

In addition to maternity leave which will certainly be on the agenda for discussion there will also be additional questions of genuine anxiety to women and women's organizations such as discrimination on the basis of marital status and age, the opportunity for women to obtain career promotions on an equitable basis, the establishment of effective and practical machinery to facilitate the enforcement of the principle of equal pay for equal work, the question of child care facilities for working mothers and a host of other questions.

Through contacts with employees and potential employees affected and their representative organizations, the Government will be in a position to develop an appropriate overall strategy applicable to working women. In the meantime it seems fair to say that the Human Rights legislation being introduced, inasmuch as it overlaps the concerns expressed in the legislation, represents the first step along the path to statutory maternity leave.

It might be useful, Mr. Speaker, very briefly to indicate the rationale for the solicitude of this Government about those among the fair sex who have entered into the world of work. There has been a dramatic increase in the number of female workers in the labor force and their role in economic and social development is becoming significantly greater.

IN 1951 there were just over 50,000 working women representing 17 per cent of the total labor force in Saskatchewan. By 1961 the number had increased to 77,000 or 23.7 per cent of the labor force. In the last ten years the number of working women has increased by 37 per cent to 106,000 and now accounts for 29 per cent of the work force in the province.

Another important phenomenon in this regard relates to the

marital status of female employees. Twenty years ago out of every 100 women working, 32 were married; today 58 out of every 100 employed women are married. It should be pointed out that a high percentage of women in the productive age group are working and are accordingly potential and eligible for maternity leave.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the part played by women in our society is changing very rapidly. In the past most married women who worked withdrew from the labor force as soon as they acquired family responsibilities. The nature of today's society is such that growing numbers of women continue to work in this kind of setting, a reflection of a multitude of social and economic factors including the emergence of new attitudes towards working mothers, the demands for skills of women, the need to ensure a relatively high level of family income which may require both parents to bring home a pay cheque and the results of advancing technology freeing housewives from many of the household tasks that formerly occupied them on a full time basis.

In recognition of the trends towards greater employment of women with family responsibilities, a number of international organizational instruments on maternity protection have been passed. These instruments, including a formal convention, cover all aspects of the consequences of pregnancy with regard to working women.

It is also apparent that the granting of maternity leave is becoming more prevalent in actual employment situations. This fact has been revealed by a number of surveys made by the Canada and Saskatchewan Departments of Labour. The most recent information published on this topic is based on a study of major collective bargaining agreements in the manufacturing industry in Canada.

The study indicates that one-third of the agreements covered provide for maternity leave with a time limitation before and after the date of birth. In one-quarter of the agreements, seniority is retained where leave is granted. It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, an acknowledgement of current trends of its obligation to lead the way, the largest employer in the province, the Government of Saskatchewan, agreed last fall to provide female civil servants for the first time with specifically identified maternity leave.

The leave covers a total of 17 weeks, 11 weeks before and 6 weeks after confinement date where an employee has completed 12 consecutive months of employment in the public service. The employee is protected against dismissal or layoffs on pregnancy grounds and is guaranteed reinstatement to her former position without loss of certain specified benefits.

This provision is a clear indication, Mr. Speaker, of the Government's recognition of the principle enunciated in the ILO convention and in the recommendations of the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada.

May I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is fully cognizant of the motivation of the mover of the Resolution in advocating legislative action to establish maternity leave. There is no doubt that this matter is one which deserves the close attention of provincial policy makers and indeed policy

makers across the country. As spelled out in the first part of the resolution, the Canada Labour Code now makes provision for maternity leave.

We will be carefully studying the code and other procedures in this connection with a view to the introduction of suitable measures in the Saskatchewan context. If something is worth doing, Mr. Speaker, it is worth doing properly and we shall accordingly be looking at all of the implications of programs which are intended to be of benefit to working women and the way in which maternity leave will best fit in to the relevant statutory framework.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the principle of the motion. I would propose to amend it to place the question of women's right in the employment sphere in a better and more global perspective. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) that Resolution No. 8 be amended thereto,

That all the words after the word "leave" in the fourth line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

and commends the Government of Saskatchewan for including maternity leave in the current Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association agreement and further commends the Department of Labour for initiating an investigation designed to examine all facets of the particular concerns of female members of the labor force, including such questions as:

- (a) maternity leave;
- (b) discrimination in employment on the basis of sex, marital status and age;
- (c) access of women to promotional opportunities;
- (d) methods of enforcing equal remuneration for equal work;
- (e) child care facilities for working mothers;

the completion of which will facilitate the development and implementation of a well-integrated legislative program applicable to working women.

Amendment agreed to.

The debate continued on the motion as amended.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, we are constantly hearing about things that ought to have occurred between 1964 and 1971. Of course, those magic dates arise because 1964 was the year in which Saskatchewan was blessed with a Liberal Government.

The Hon. Member did not tell us why he, with a government that professed labor and people as a top priority, did not do this between 1944 and 1964. These people are always saying that they have always given this type of thing top priority but it is a good thing for them that there were seven years of Liberal



rule because they would have had no excuse for not bringing this in if it hadn't occurred.

I remind the Hon. Member and I am sure that he does remember that it was our side of the House and not his that brought the age factor into the various statutes that he referred to. Age was not one of the matters of discrimination that were protected by the legislation as submitted by the Government.

Age was one of our concerns. With a Government that is so concerned about people and their problems, age is a serious concern and that was one of the problems that we absolutely insisted should go into legislation.

I also want to draw to the attention of the Members of the House that this resolution appeared in August of last year, that was a session of the House that was unnecessary but if it was to be a session held for the purposes of Government congratulations it should have done a few things. And one of the things that we put on the Order Paper was this resolution that relates to the allowance of maternity leave to women who have been employed at least one year. It wasn't until some time after the resolution was put on the Order Paper that the Government was moved to take steps, as an employer itself, to allow women employed by the Provincial Government to have maternity leave.

They were prompted to do so because they knew that they would see a repeat of this resolution in this session and they wanted to be able to stand up and tell everybody that they themselves had instituted such a policy. But I do regret that the amendment seems to imply that they will not put this kind of legislation on the books for other employers.

The amendment implies that they are going to talk about it, they are going to study it and they are going to think about it, but the one thing they are going to do is put this legislation on the books.

If they put it on the books it is clearly by implication not coming at this Session. We have now had two sessions of this Legislature both of which were presented with this kind of resolution. It is not a difficult piece of legislation and it is a far more necessary piece of legislation for people employed around the Province of Saskatchewan than some of the 'fluff' legislation that we have had in this Session. I said 'fluff' but I could have meant 'flub' legislation.

It is quite obvious that they are not intending to adopt 'hasty' legislation in this regard. I very much regret that they have implied that they are going to defer this to some future date.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 14 – HISTORIC OBLIGATION OF RAILWAY COMPANIES**

**Mr. M. Feschuk (Prince Albert East)** moved, seconded by Mr. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to remember the historic obligation of the Railway Companies to transport agricultural products to markets, and recognize the importance of exports, particularly agricultural exports, in providing national income and employment and earning foreign exchange, now given direction, assistance and instruction in all aspects of grain-handling and transportation with initial and particular attention to the utilization and re-organization of railroad facilities and grain-handling and loading facilities.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, in saying a few words to this resolution may I first say that I intend to be very brief.

I believe that when this country was first developed and that when the government of the day had the foresight that a railroad was necessary in Canada, the government of the day went to the bargaining tables. I believe the government of the day bargained in good faith. I believe that they took into consideration the economy of our country and were acting in the best interests of its people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should remember some of the terms of reference that were acknowledged and some of the concessions that were made. I believe that we ought to remember where the responsibilities lie.

Mr. Speaker, when the people of this nation elect a Government of Canada and when matters of inter-provincial interest are involved, I submit that the Government of Canada must sort out the priorities. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Government of Canada in the late 19th Century gave the railway company great powers and more than generous concessions. The Government said that the company may for the purposes of the undertaking enter into and onto Crown lands without previous licence thereto, and upon the lands of any person whomsoever, lying in the intended route or line of the railway and make surveys, examinations and other necessary arrangements of such lands for fixing the right of way of the railway and set out and ascertained such parts of the lands that are necessary and proper for the railway.

The Government of Canada also said that the railway company could receive, take and hold all voluntary grants and donations of lands and other property or any bonus of money or debentures or other benefit of any sort, may do it for the purpose of aiding in construction, maintenance and accommodation of the railway. The Government of Canada also said that the railway could purchase, take and hold, often from any person, any lands and other property necessary for the construction, maintenance and operation of the railway and also, alienate, sell and dispose of, all goods and lands and property of the company which for any reason have become not necessary for the purpose of the railway.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada of that day gave the railways even more powers when they gave the railway the right to cross any railway or join the railway with

the necessary conveniences for the purpose of such connections.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and to this House that there is no excuse why the Federal Government of Canada today can not give the necessary direction and instruction to the railway companies to reorganize their facilities and move western grain to the Vancouver port.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse such as too much snow or rock slides or no railway tracks as my friend the Hon. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) said a few days ago. When we consider that was said 60 years ago by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking at Niagara Falls on September 18, 1907 and I quote,

We have undertaken the construction of another railway, the Hudson Bay railway. At the present time all of the wheat, as soon as it is tracked is sent out to Lake Superior. We want to provide another railway by Hudson Bay. There will then be the present route and the Hudson Bay route and a man who raises his wheat and cattle will have two outlets for his production.

The trade of Canada is too great even for these two outlets. The Government will build the railway or rather someone will be trusted to building it for the Government, but whatever we do, all the terminals and all the elevators shall be built by the Government and redeemed under all and every circumstance by the Government so as to ensure the largest measure of benefit possible to the Canadian people of the northwest provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and I submit to this House and I submit to the people of Canada that it is not the amount of snow in the mountains, it is not the out-dated railway system, it is not the shortage of space in the terminals, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have an out-dated Liberal Government in Ottawa.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — Mr. Speaker, as far back as 1919 the Liberal Prime Minister, Mackenzie King promised the terminal grain storage facilities at Prince Rupert, British Columbia would be built to facilitate efficient grain traffic flows.

Mr. Speaker, that is going back to the days of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1908 when he recognized that railways, terminals and elevators should be owned by the Government of Canada to ensure the largest measure of benefit possible to the Canadian people, when the Government of that day recognized that two outlets were not enough for this country, that was over 60 years ago when the Government in 1908 recognized that the trade of Canada was too great and too important to lose. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Liberal Government is over 60 years behind the times. And that Federal Liberal Government has failed the people of Canada and particularly those in Western Canada.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that since the last few days it was possible to divert some 18 trains to the Pacific Great Eastern lines and surely it is possible to reorganize the railroad facilities for grain-handling and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley

(Mr. Hanson) Resolution No. 14.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. T.L. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, the historic obligation of the railroads in Canada to move agricultural produce has not been upheld. The deterioration that has occurred in the last 10 years in the handling of grain is a deliberate attempt, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the railways and the Federal Government to shut down our branch lines and move us toward the establishment of interior terminals and unit trains and finally to adjust the Crow's Nest rates upwards. I'd like to quote a couple of statements from a news release by the Palliser Wheat Growers' Association dated March 11th. It says,

The Palliser Wheat Growers' Association's First Vice President, Art Thompson of Pense says he is 'damn good and mad' at the way Canada's grain-handling system is being managed. Mr. Thompson returned today from attending the 13th National Farm and Business Forum of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. 'Government and grain officials are now admitting publicly what we have been saying for two years. Charlie Gibbings, a Wheat Pool Commissioner, told us yesterday that Canada has been passing up wheat sales opportunities for two and a half years because the Port of Vancouver couldn't take any more grain. When we said that same thing last year, we were branded as instant experts and virtually told to mind our own business.' Mr. Thompson also said that Mr. Gibbings' announcement probably came as a result of the Hon. Otto Lang telling the House of Commons last week that grain sales through the Wet Coast had been curtailed because they had reached their capacity to handle it.

I find today's statement of the diversion of two trains of grain a welcome reality, emphasizing the importance of a Provincial Government with guts to declare an emergency debate on this matter to get public and senior government attention to our proposal.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hanson:** — I must congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your ruling permitting debate which woke somebody up down East. It is a fact that in the last couple of weeks the railroad diverted 18 trains to the Pacific Great Eastern or British Columbia Railway as it is now known. But only two of these trains carried grain, both barley, at a time when the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool terminal was out of wheat. I wonder if the experts on research sitting opposite know just how many cars the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool unloaded last Wednesday, for example. Was it 300, 200 . . . ?

**Mr. Rolfes:** — 100?

**Mr. Hanson:** — Not 100, not even 50. 14 cars were unloaded by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool last Wednesday. I would suggest that this terrific record of performance, when Vancouver need to unload 800 cars per day just to meet our sales, is a real example

of just what the people in charge of the grain situation are doing. Under good conditions, Mr. Speaker, the facilities at Vancouver can only handle about 600 cars per day. The total number of cars being handled at the West Coast is about 700 cars per day. Thunder Bay will also need about 1,700 boxcars a day from April 15 on to meet their requirements when the shipping season starts. It is an impossible situation, Mr. Speaker, under the present administration. The credibility of the Liberals was once again proven to be non-existent.

I should like the House to recall the comments by the Hon. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) during the emergency debate with regard to the use of Pacific Great Eastern trackage. I seem to recollect the Member saying 'no track' continuously after we brought up the proposal and he also stated, 'I've been in touch with officials and they need 30 or 40 miles of track' and he suggested that this was just another dream scheme by the NDP. Yet this diversion worked as do most of our NDP proposals, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hanson:** — Accepting the superboy's from Lumsden IQ to be real high, I have prepared a map with colored routes using the three most easily distinguished colors, Mr. Speaker, marking the different routes so that he may understand the complex situation in the diversion we requested to use. Could I have a Page to deliver the map to the Hon. Member?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — He left the House.

**Mr. Hanson:** — I think perhaps we can deliver it to the agriculture critic then, the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald).

The Canadian National line from Edmonton is marked in green and goes either to Vancouver or Prince Rupert, the 'Y' or switch off being made at Red Pass Junction. The Canadian Pacific line from Calgary which is marked in blue goes through Rogers Pass which is a very bad slide area, then west to Kamloops, Ashcroft, Lytton and on to Vancouver. The Pacific Great Eastern or British Columbia Railroad, as it is now known, is marked in red and travels northeast from Vancouver intercepting with the Canadian National at Prince George. Let's just take a quick look at the Canadian National. By simply continuing westward at Red Pass Junction as though their destination was Prince Rupert, they can switch on to the British Columbia Railroad at Prince George and then head south to Vancouver. The Canadian Pacific, to use this diversion, would probably use the Canadian National tracks from Edmonton westward. If you will notice, the British Columbia Railroad and the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific are within 30 miles of each other near Lytton and Ashcroft and I would presume this is the stretch of track that the Hon. Member was mentioning that we were requesting be built.

We in this Government are demanding that a connecting track be built from either Ashcroft to Clinton which would be 30 miles.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hanson:** — Or from Lytton to Lilloet, remember, the diversion we suggested has already worked.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hanson:** — Both routes, Mr. Speaker, are not that impractical to build as highways connect these centres through two valleys or depressions and the grades are not that severe.

Recognizing that the two slide areas most hampering the grain movement are in the Hope region which is the Fraser Canyon region north of Hope, anyone can see that with these diversions we could have a workable route 98 per cent of the time without the added 150 miles involved in the Prince George diversion.

You may say, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of 35 miles of track through the Rockies isn't justified or that the added 150 miles of hauling via Prince George is costing the farmers too much. Probably an additional three cents per bushel or \$1 a ton for the use of trackage in extra miles hauled would be involved. We farmers in these prairie provinces has been paying an average demurrage charge of \$3,000 per day per ship for ships waiting for grain to arrive in Vancouver. Some days in January and February when there were 20 to 27 ships collecting demurrage charges, we were dishing out \$50,000 to \$70,000 per day.

The British Columbia Railroad can handle about 400 cars per day making possible at least 800,000 bushels arriving daily when other routes are blocked by slides. This is enough to load one very good sized ship. Remember, if we are to meet our sales commitments, Vancouver must unload an average 800 cars per day and Thunder Bay 1,700 cars per day after April 15th. They said it couldn't be done, this hare-brained diversion onto the British Columbia Railroad. We said it could.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hanson:** — Now it is a reality. But will they continue to use it or build the additional track needed for sensible connection? Knowing the mood of the railroad officials and the Federal Government, I very much doubt it.

I welcomed last week's announcement of the harbour improvements budgeted for Prince Rupert. They are contemplating on spending some \$5 million, Mr. Speaker, to upgrade the grain-handling facilities there. But will the money be spent, I ask the Hon. Members? I doubt it. Remember my statements about the Liberal Party being experts in the 'say lots, mean little, do nothing philosophy'. I want to bring to your attention the fact that Prime Minister Mackenzie King promised such a project in 1919.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, that was just yesterday!

**Mr. Hanson:** — I'm sure glad it is an election year. I might have believed the announcement. Prince Rupert has handled as high as 17 million bushels in the 1965-66 season but has averaged only 10 million bushels per year over the last ten years. Do the Hon. Members opposite know why ships don't like going there?

March 28, 1972

They take on their cargo but can't even fuel up for the trip home. They have to go to Vancouver for fuel and I suggest that real senior government concern over the use of this port is not there when they won't even provide a fuel station to service ocean-going freighters.

I should like the Members opposite to listen to a few facts about the Prince Rupert facilities. One ship refuelled this year out there and how did it do it? By a tank truck floating on a barge.

**An Hon. Member:** — A typical Liberal approach!

**Mr. Hanson:** — The Port of Prince Rupert can unload 60 cars a day when there are cars available. Only one switch engine is there in the CN yards. Sometimes the elevators have to wait hours for just a simple shunt of cars. The elevator at Prince Rupert can unload 100 cars per day six days a week and clean the grain. We don't need the inland terminals for cleaning if they can just get the grain. Mr. Speaker, with 100 cars unloading per day and two shifts, we could handle 1.2 million bushels per week at the Port of Prince Rupert. The shipments averaging out to 10 million bushels per year at Prince Rupert that I quoted works out to an average full time weekly load of two shifts working six days per nine weeks out of the year. That's the record of performance for the Port of Prince Rupert. Working to full capacity, they work only nine weeks.

As I said at the start, I believe the ultimate aim of the railroads is to negotiate the Crow's Nest rates but they want us to give in on some minor things. Minor things, I say, like branch lines before they really hit us hard. I say let's negotiate now before the economy is wrecked by their blackmail attempt to reach their final goal.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hanson:** — We need, Mr. Speaker, someone solely in charge of the movement of grain and of the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hanson:** — Mr. Speaker, we need a Minister with guts to tell the railroad what is best for Canada's farmers, what is best for Canada's people and not just what is best for Canada's railroads. We need someone with guts to research every alternative possible when the bottlenecks occur — that's not Otto. And more important, we need someone who will research every alternative before they occur — the bottlenecks. This we do not have and no matter how loud the Members opposite sing praises to Otto Lang, the farmers know they have already lost grain sales this year through a failure to tackle the problems in shipping.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would give a word of suggestion to the Members sitting opposite — wake up, boys, you can't keep everybody in the dark just because you can't see. Buy yourselves a candle, open your eyes, open your ears, and most important of all, open your minds.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate, but after listening to the Member, the rookie Member for Qu'Appelle, there is only one suggestion I have. Fire your speech writer, for goodness sake.

Mr. Speaker, for the past three weeks we have witnessed one of the greatest grandstand performances that makes less sense on behalf of the farmers of Saskatchewan than any resolution that has ever been put before this House. And I want to explain, Mr. Speaker. First of all we sent the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) to Vancouver to inspect the grain-handling facilities.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we sent them at the taxpayers' expense, and do you know what they came back and said? That the top priority of that particular Party and the top priority of that Government in the grain-handling problem and situation in Western Canada was to build a new railway or a connecting link of railway in case every five years we had a snow slide. This is the height and sense of that recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the grain-handling problem. Mr. Speaker, imagine, sure this year we have a snow slide problem in the Fraser Valley, no question about it. But if they consider that that is the solution and the top priority of the Western Canadian farmer in order to solve the grain-handling and the delivery system in Western Canada, then there is something wrong with their agricultural knowledge. Let's have a look at the delivery system problem. First of all there are many problems.

You listen, Mr. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer), because you need a little advice too. First of all, we have got an antiquated delivery system in Saskatchewan. We've got elevators, Mr. Speaker, that were put up in the horse and buggy age. They should be modernized, they should be centralized, they should be relocated, naturally. Number two, Mr. Speaker, we've got inadequate rail facilities. First of all, in relation to hopper cars, in relation to good delivery systems in order to get the grain out on a unit basis or whatever is required. Number three, we've got track problems relating to the Canadian winter which would occur periodically, Mr. Speaker. This is the first time it's been of any serious proportion as long as I have been in this House. The fourth thing, Mr. Speaker, we have inadequate cleaning and handling and loading facilities at the West Coast. But most important of all, Mr. Speaker, we have inadequate storage facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Pacific rim is fast becoming one of the major ports for the major markets for Canadian wheat. If we intend to ever reach a one billion capacity export sales, the one thing we are going to have to do is to increase the capacity at the West Coast terminals. This is without question. Mr. Speaker, the serious problem is related not to how we get the grain out there but the fact that we don't have enough storage facilities out there and because these are relatively new markets, none of the existing companies on the West Coast are willing to invest the capital to build up those storage facilities. Mr. Speaker, these problems, of course, have been brought to light in the last two or three weeks with the problem



of the snow storms in the Fraser Valley. Now what does the NDP recommend for this, Mr. Speaker? A diversion of the rail system to handle a ten day problem once every five years as their priority. Every farm organization, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Farmers' Union, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and every farm organization in Western Canada said there is one priority and that is to increase the storage capacity on the West Coast. That's the number one priority. And if we have got any money to spend let's put it there so that if there is a snow storm in the Fraser Valley, the ships can continue to load and we don't have demurrage payments and there won't be any hold-up on the export sales in Canadian wheat. That's Mr. Speaker, is the top priority and quit talking nonsense about building a new railway.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that they must remember. What this House needs, Mr. Speaker, is a real sincere resolution that is not politically orientated, that is not there as a gimmick or as a grandstand performance of the Minister of Agriculture and the Attorney General. You know, they must have somebody to see out in Vancouver, they leave on a Friday night and they come back on a Monday morning. They could have picked up the telephone and phoned 10 organizations in Saskatchewan and provided the same information they gave in this House. It was a face, it was phoney, it was ridiculous and it is exactly the same as this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that is before the House. If they want to do something for the Western Canadian farmer and the grain-handling situation on the West Coast, then let's put a resolution from this House asking the Federal Government to immediately increase the storage facilities on the West Coast. That's what is needed. We've got a railway that is hauling carloads of wheat for \$400 a car approximately taking them away from carloads of other commodities that give them \$800 a car. They are trying to deliver wheat on a crisis basis when five or 10 or 15 or 20 ships come into port instead of a systematic hauling to a regular system and a big storage capacity. And if they could turn around and deliver carloads of wheat every day of the year and they had storage capacity at the West Coast there wouldn't be the problem that exists today because of the snow storms in the Fraser Valley, Mr. Speaker. Never, since I have been in this House has there been a bigger insult to the Western Canadian farmer than to say the top priority is to build a diversion of the railway to look after a ten day snow storm when the storage capacities and the handling situation and the cleaning facilities and everything else are the number one priority and every Western Canadian farmer knows it and every Western Canadian farm organization knows it and it's time the Minister of Agriculture started to quit talking nonsense. Mr. Speaker, I have not had time, as I say I wasn't going to enter this debate, I have an amendment to this resolution that I hope every Member in this House will urge the Federal Government to give priority where priority is required instead of talking gobble-de-gook and nonsense. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

#### RETURN NO. 41

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 41 showing:

- (a) Whether there has been any change in Government policy since July 1, 1971 respecting reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut for use by MacMillan Bloedel at Hudson Bay.
- (b) If so, the substance of the changes.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Stand.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Can I ask the Attorney General whether there have been any returned turned in to this House since the House opened?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'm not sure. I think there have been but I am not sure. Well, I think the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) in the course of debate brought to my attention the wording of one return that was returned back over my name.

**Mr. Lane:** — That was from last summer.

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'm not sure. I could check into it and find out.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Never in the history of this Legislature have we been in session 25 days and never got one return.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We are dealing with adjourned debates not on returns. This should be raised on question of Orders of the Day and not in the midst of adjourned debates.

#### RETURN NO. 42

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Guy (Athabasca) for Return No. 42 showing:

- (a) Whether there has been any change in Government policy since July 1, 1971 respecting reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut for use by Prince Albert Pulp Company, Prince Albert, at Hudson Bay.
- (b) If so, the substance of the changes.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Stand.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, is the request to stand debatable?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Any item on the Order Paper according to our rules can

be left to stand at the request of the Government. The Government can request them to stand even if private Members, even a private Member's motion it must be the request of the Government although we haven't tried to enforce that rule.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, the question I've raised to your attention, Sir, is whether or not the request of the Government to stand is debatable.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, I don't think it is debatable. The question could be put if there was too much objection it would be decided immediately by the House but not debated.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I may be wrong, Sir, but it seems to me that when we utter on one side or the other that word 'stand', it is a motion that the question do stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, what would happen . . .

**Mr. McIsaac:** — As such it should be. If it is agreed to it should be debatable shouldn't it?

**Mr. Speaker:** — If some Members say No, then I would have put the question. Is it the wish of the House that the motion shall stand?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, when do we get a chance to speak on the question of whether or not it shall stand and that's the point I should like to comment on now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The motion is not debatable. It is the same as a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn is not debatable but the question must be put right away but it is not debatable, it is not a debatable question.

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I submit to you that the motion to stand is a courtesy motion which has been allowed by both sides of the Assembly over a period of time. But I also submit, Mr. Speaker, that it not necessarily be allowed when a Member has a motion in his name and he asks for it to stand, if another person wishes to speak on that particular motion, he may do so. The reason we have not done so in the past was usually because we allowed the courtesy of leaving it on the Order Paper in that particular place. But I submit that if you check back over the rules that you will find that when a Member asks the motion to stand that another Member has the right to stand up and speak to that motion if he wishes.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I should like to read to the House Standing Rule No. 9. It says,

Questions put by Members and motions not taken up when called may, upon the request of the Government, be allowed to stand and retain their precedence, otherwise they

will disappear from the Order Paper. They may be however, renewed.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on that Point of Order, Sir. That, of course, means the precedence of staying on the Order Paper, that is not related, Sir, to the right to speak. Any time a motion in this House, Sir, that the individual whose name is on the Order Paper and that person asks it to stand, any Member in the House who disagrees with that privilege or that courtesy request can stand up and speak on the motion, Sir. The only thing that Rule 9 of the blue book indicates is as to whether or not that will remain and carry its precedence on the Order Paper or whether it will have to be resubmitted.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Might I very briefly and hopefully add a few words to this Point of Order. I really haven't turned my mind to the technicalities of whether or not a stand is debatable or not. I am prepared to abide by your ruling, Sir. I have always viewed a 'stand' as, by and large, taken as the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) says, by courtesy. If a Member says 'stand', then certainly I don't recall this Session that we have challenged 'stands'. Bills have been stood by Members of the Opposition. Motions have been stood. We've stood a couple of them. I should certainly hate to see the House, in effect, break an informal understanding, if I may use the word, if a Members asks for 'stand' that he is usually trying to get more information to the matter. Certainly that's the case here. I think it would be a very bad situation if we have Opposition Members asking to stand some Government Bills and the matter being put to a vote. On that basis, we are prepared to take their observation if they are not ready to go, same with us, on courtesy and I put it in that light and perhaps maybe Members would reconsider the business of debating the stand request.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, this is a private Members' day. These are questions that we have asked and if the motions are all in the Government Members' names that they have adjourned it, these motions are moved by Members on this side of the House and they stand, you might as well do away with the private Members' day because we have no opportunity to get the information, we have no opportunity to go down the Order Paper, it's all in the Government's hands and this is a farce as far as we are concerned when they won't give us the information. They just get up, 'stand, stand' and they rule us out three to one. If you don't make a fair ruling we might as well go home.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order again. I can certainly tell the Hon. Member and the Members of this House that the reason why items two to six inclusive have been stood is because we are still seeking to obtain the information and the Members of the House will have an opportunity to debate these motions. We do not intend to use the ruse that the Member from Rosthern says implies, we do not do that. I am asking Members to give us more time. The matter will be back up again at the next private Members' day and I hope that on the next private Members' day the situation can be resolved one way or the other.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on that and with deference, Sir, I don't want to turn this into a political debate but that is ridiculous. When the Order for Return is passed the Government can take six months if they want to get the information. We are not asking them to pass whether or not they will give us the information today, we're asking them whether or not they are going to pass these Orders for Returns, Sir. We are not wishing to go against the courtesy of the House in relation to 'stand'. What we want to point out, Sir, is that the Estimates are now before us, the purpose of asking questions in the House is to obtain information so that we may use them in the Estimates and all we want to do on this particular motion is to point out to the Government that we have been in here now about 23 or 24 sitting days and they have yet to return one Order for Return to provide information to the Members of the Opposition in order to be prepared for Estimates. We do not demand this information immediately if it is not available. When you pass an Order for Return, Sir, some of them are passed the first day, they are not yet tabled, we are not asking him to provide the information at the date of approval.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order. I think the position of the Government has been misunderstood. With respect to these which, I think Members opposite will agree, have just appeared on the Order Paper, I don't mean very recently but they are not old, they are Motions for Return Nos. 41, 42, 38, 37, they are not Nos. 1 or 2. As Members will know, a government looks at these motions when they are put on the Order Paper to see whether the information can be provided in the form requested and if not, it is traditional to move an amendment to put them in a form where it can relatively easily be given. This is perfectly standard and I hope that is not open to argument. Admittedly, we should get around to analyzing these things quicker than we have in this case, I am prepared to admit this. I am just saying that of these particular five, the last four are in the field of Natural Resources and the Minister of Natural Resources was in Winnipeg on legitimate Government business last week for a couple of days when we might have got this work done. We just haven't got to it. The Minister was in Crown Corporations Committee today when we hoped to get it done. I just spoke to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) on this, and he says that he has had a quick look at them and they look all right. We will undertake to get them right in and we'll accommodate them to get these off the Order Paper one way or the other.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — I certainly accept what the Premier has indicated and there is no way in which we can request him to speak on a 'stand' motion and we had no intention of trying to force the Government to provide the information immediately. But we did want to take the opportunity to point out that this was the purpose of these questions — for Estimates. The Premier has given us his assurance and we'll accept that until the next private Members' day.

**Mr. Guy:** — On the Point of Order. I should like to have one point clarified. It is not an argumentative point. It is my understanding and I certainly stand to be corrected, that on a motion such as this, if he doesn't wish to speak on it at that time he can say 'stand'. Am I correct in my understanding then that any other Member in the Assembly has then the right to

speak, but the Member in whose name it stands does not lose his right. In other words, he can get up at a future time – I believe if I recall correctly, the Premier did that last year on one debate, it was standing in his name, somebody else spoke, he spoke afterwards – I should like to have that clarified not for this particular motion but just as a rule of the House, Mr. Speaker.

### **SPEAKER'S RULING ON 'STAND' ON MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think if the House will bear with me so that I won't take time to make a prepared ruling, I may be a little repetitious. On this question here of 'stand' as No. 9 says, "Any order can be 'stand' at the request of the Government". The usual practice, if a private Member has asked to 'stand', if there was no objection taken, it has been allowed to 'stand'. But it would be if we followed the rules strictly that the Government, a Member of the Treasury Benches, must request it to stand otherwise it would be dropped if it wasn't taken up. If a motion is made that it 'stand' that is not debatable but if a Member says No it would be my duty to say, "Those in favor of the motion 'stand' and we would take a vote.

In answer to the question of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), if some Member adjourns a motion and they don't rise to speak to this motion when the motion is next called, they just sit there, some other Member may get up and speak. That person who has the adjournment in his name has not lost the right to speak. But if he gets up and asks that it 'stand' then he has made a second motion and he would then have lost his right to speak. But if a Member who has adjourned a debate like a number of these we are on now, if they don't speak or don't rise, some other Member could speak and the other Member has a right to come back and speak afterwards. It is quite plain in Beauchesne that having adjourned the debate you are not deprived from taking part in the debate later on if you do not exercise your right to speak when first called. But a second motion would eliminate that, so to say 'stand' would eliminate it if the House rejected the motion to stand. I hope I have made this clear for the Members of this House and we can proceed on this understanding.

**Mr. Guy:** — Just one further question, Mr. Speaker, Did I understand you correctly that if a Member from the Government says 'stand' then no other Member of the Assembly can rise and speak to that motion at that time. Is this correct?

**Mr. Speaker:** — If they wish to rise and speak at that time then the House would have to decide by majority whether the debate should continue or whether it should stand. Because they've made a motion, the same as an adjourning motion, only it is a standing motion. So it becomes a motion which is not debatable and the House by majority would decide at that time. If the House rejected the 'stand' motion, other Members could speak. If they didn't, it would stand in the name of the Member who had asked it to stand if the Government agrees to it.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to clear up one more point. On March 21st, according to the White Paper here, it was moved by Mr. Guy that an Order of Assembly do issue for Return No. 41. Today is the 28th, and when the Premier says they

only appeared on the Order Paper for a couple of days he is not telling the facts. You had eight days' time to make up your mind whether you are going to answer the question or not and apparently you don't want to answer the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We must not start debating that because we could get into a long debate if we started debating those things and it would interfere with what we are trying to do now.

**Mr. Lane:** — Just one further point on this, just for clarification. The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) mentioned that I had referred to an Order for Return the other day that I have received that was an Order for Return made in the special session last summer.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 1 – OPPOSING PROVIDING OF PRINTING CONTRACTS TO SERVICE PRINTING COMPANY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):

That this Assembly go on record as opposing any policy of the Saskatchewan Government which would provide printing contracts to Service Printing Co., which is solely owned and operated by the CCF Publishing Co. Ltd., which is owned by the membership of the New Democratic Party (Saskatchewan division).

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:

that all the words after the word “as” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

favoring a policy of providing, as near as practical, an equitable opportunity for Saskatchewan printing companies to obtain printing contracts regardless of political affiliation, provided they are capable of doing such work on a competitive basis under fair wage and working conditions.

**Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden):** — When I adjourned the debate on this matter I had called the Members' attention to Section 14 of The Legislative Assembly Act and I had also quoted that particular section. That section, Mr. Speaker, sets out the principle that binds all of us as Members of this Assembly and basically we are not to obtain any profit or any office because of our election as Members. I have traced that back somewhat, I find it is exactly the same in the 1920 Revised Statutes and I have taken it back to the Territorial Legislative Assembly and it is just about exactly the same on that point, indicating, of course, to all of us that this principle has been binding on Members of Legislature and Members of the British Parliament probably since its inception as a democratically elected parliament. It is something that we can't take lightly and when we are dealing with the question of Service Printing, I have raised a matter that Cabinet Ministers are required by tradition of this House – and it is not stated in

The Legislative Assembly Act – to give up all outside offices. It is not because we don't trust Cabinet Ministers, the reason is that there is a potential for abuse in the public's mind and they are requested to give up all other outside offices and directorships. It is this potential for abuse that is in reality the principle in Section 14 of The Legislative Assembly Act and it is the potential for abuse that has been covered in all the legislation on this particular aspect. The principle is over-riding I submit and I stated the last time that it is not the question as to whether Service Printing can bid competitively or tender competitively, it is this principle of a potential for abuse that we are arguing in favor of, Mr. Speaker.

This tradition and the historical tradition that has existed in protecting the public and ensuring that the public has a concept before them that the Members of the Legislature have removed the potential for abuse, as I say, has a great historical tradition. Now, what has been done about this principle is that over the years the principle has not necessarily worked in all circumstances and in many, many cases, there are some very, very common sense situations that arise that Members should be allowed to enter into contract or be able to deal with the Government and not take away from the principle.

In the Territorial Legislation, as I say, the similar section, the only except was that the section would not be construed to apply to the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, allowing them, of course, to take those offices. Whenever there has been an exception, it has been put into statute and the exceptions and I submit correctly so, have been put in Section 15 and these have been amended from time to time to bring them up to date, such things as allowing a Member to receive moneys for expropriation of his lands by a government agency who being a municipal official performed services and is also a Member. The principle has been so upheld and so ingrained that by statute only have exceptions to the principle been allowed. So we have the principle that there shall not be a potential for abuse by Members and where in a common sense situation there should be exception to the rule, they are stated in the statute. I submit, Mr. Speaker, if the Government opposite feels sincerely that Service Printing should have government contracts, I submit that the Government should bring in an amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act to allow for this type of practice.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lane:** — I submit that the principle of whether or not as I have said Service Printing should have government contracts is not the point. It is not the point that they can bid lower or anything else, it is in the public's mind I think there already is an idea with the question of Service Printing and there is a potential for abuse because of the Members of the Party being so involved in the printing company. I submit again, Mr. Speaker, if the Members opposite feel so strongly that Service Printing should have government contracts that the only correct and proper way to do it is to bring in an amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act and amend Section 15 to allow this practice.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!



**Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca):** — Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the amendment not on the motion.

I want just to bring to the attention of the Assembly that the amendment moved by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Brockelbank) deals with political affiliation. I should like to suggest to the House that political affiliation and a political ownership are two different things. There is no question that the Service Printing Company is owned solely by the New Democratic Party. I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan, in due deference to what the Premier has said that he sees nothing wrong with it, will agree that they are prepared to see their tax dollars go from individuals who are of any or all or perhaps no political persuasion to the benefit of a single political party regardless of what the political party might be. It is wrong and I wish the Premier would stand up in his seat and explain to the House and the people of Saskatchewan why he believes it is right. I think, in view of the fact that he made a press release earlier in the year saying he did approve of this practice, that he should be prepared to stand up tonight while this resolution and amendment is before the House and give his reasons why he believes that the taxpayers' money should go directly to the CCF Printing Company. If he can justify it then perhaps the people of Saskatchewan will accept it. Until he is prepared to justify it on much sounder grounds than he has to date, so far they are not sound, all we are saying is that it is wrong morally and ethically to use the taxpayers' money for his own political Party by directing it through the Queen's Printer.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — I just want to say one word on this. I am not going to prolong the debate, Mr. Speaker. I am concerned about the amendment and I should like to bring it to the attention of Members opposite. I am not sure, I am not a lawyer, perhaps the Attorney General of the Premier can say. Is this amendment of the Minister of Public Works suggesting that I, Cy MacDonald or I, Allan Blakeney, sitting in this Legislative Assembly with a printing company that I own and operate, that I have a right to all government business and bids and take contracts from any government business because that's the way I read this amendment. It negates that principle whereby a Member of the Treasury Benches will resign his position as a board of director of a company, it negates every principle that I understand is sacred and precious to the democratic process and the parliamentary system and the cabinet system. I am not sure, Sir, if I understand this correctly, but that is the only interpretation I can take from this amendment. Mr. Speaker, I just suggest that I hope there isn't one Member in this Assembly who will vote for a resolution that says that the Premier of this province can own a printing company and that he can do government business as long as he does it on a fair and equitable basis.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words to this debate. Firstly, I should like to deal with the matter raised by the Member for Milestone. What we are doing in this amendment is to point out that we favor a policy of providing an equitable opportunity for Saskatchewan printing companies to obtain printing contracts regardless of political affiliation provided they are capable of doing such work on a competitive basis. That seems to me incapable of misinterpretation by anyone

who tries to read it fairly. Let me say, of course, if the Members opposite want us to move a sub-amendment we will be happy to support a sub-amendment to provide that all would be subject to the provisions of The Legislative Assembly Act. I would not have thought it necessary to say that we were proposing that the law of the land be adhered to. But if we want to add that the law of the land shall be adhered to we are happy to say that we believe the law of the land should be adhered to.

And that is indeed the law of the land. As the Member for Milestone well knows, if any Member of this House personally owns a business we cannot do business with the Government, or that business cannot do business with the Government. He also knows that it is entirely possible for people beneficially to own shares in companies which do business with the Government. The Member well knows and I suspect, without wanting to name names, I suspect that there are Members of this House who own shares in companies which do business with the Government of Saskatchewan. This is perfectly legal and proper under The Legislative Assembly Act. It has been the custom for many, many years and I would have thought it surprising that this is put into question. If it is, it will be a very great widening of the custom which currently prevails. If Members opposite feel that ought to be the law they can introduce a Bill to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. It seems to me that this would be something that has not been done anywhere else in Canada.

Now then, let me see where we are. It is clear that if the Member for Milestone or the Member for Lumsden owns shares in a printing company, that printing company could do business with the Government. It is now somehow suggested that because some people have a political affiliation with a group which wants to be free to bid on Government contracts that this is some how irregular. Surely this is not nearly as close to affiliation as if one owns shares in the company. This is and has been perfectly proper under the laws of this province.

I should like to make another few side comments. I frankly see no conceivable distinction between this company which is associated in part – and I will come to that in a moment – with a political party in this province and an advertising agency which has the advertising account for a particular political party and when thereupon the Government of the Day gives a substantial amount of Government business to that advertising agency. It seems to me that the likely benefit to Members of the Government is just about exactly the same. Let everybody be perfectly assured that if anyone can draw any subtle distinction in those particular areas they are indeed subtle.

May I also meet the point raised by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). Here I am giving straight information to the House and notwithstanding what the most recent record on the records of the Provincial Secretary say, the CCF Publishing and Printing Company is not solely or mainly or to any substantial extent owned by the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. And the record files there is simply wrong and I invite him to look back at some of the older ones which were right. I am not denying that the company is affiliated. It has some connections with the Party so I don't think we should put that in issue. I think the straight question is whether or not that type of an affiliation is any different that any number of other affiliations such as the ownership of shares which, I submit, has long been the custom in this Legislature, whether it should be or not or the

arrangement with an advertising agency which has long been the custom in these Legislatures, whether it should be or not.

If we want to say that there should be a complete divorce between the political party and the Government in power, let's say it. But let's not pick out this particular arrangement and suggest that it is somehow different in principle from the arrangements which had prevailed. I want to urge upon the conscience of Members opposite whether or not any of them or their colleagues have not owned shares in companies that do business with the Government.

**Mr. Boldt:** — You worry about yours and I'll worry about mine.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) always, I know, feels that his conscience is above reproach. Humility is not one of his most outstanding virtues. But everyone on his side of the House may not have the similar conviction. I think, as I say, before we nail our colors to the mast on this, I invite everybody to check. Because I think that we have in this House and in all the other Legislatures and in the Parliament of Canada long had a tradition of whereby it was not considered improper to own shares in a company that did business with the Government. And if that be the case, surely there is nothing wrong with having a much more tenuous, much more tenuous, relationship with a company which wants to feel free to bid competitively on contracts with the Government.

I think this is what we are talking about and I don't think there is any reason why Members opposite should feel that they are free at least of implied criticism of the kind raised by the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) because there are all sorts of Members of this House, past and present, who have had indirect associations with agencies that do business with the Government. I am not about to start listing them because it sounds like I am impugning motives. But there is no difficulty in listing some if Members opposite feel that this would contribute to the debate as I think it won't. I invite you to review the facts concerning Members past and present and see whether some do not have indirect affiliations with companies which are doing business with Government agencies, with Government Crown corporations or the like.

These are the facts. And frankly, I think government is so all pervasive today that if we tried to make a rule which said that nobody can have any type of affiliation with a company or business that does business with the Government, we would be barring a very large number of people from participating in public life. I think this is true because people habitually own mutual fund shares — to use the most tenuous relationship — they own shares of a fund which in turn owns shares in a company which owns shares in a company which does business with the Government. This is very tenuous. Next one up, they own shares in companies, great national corporations, which do business with the Government. Next one up, they own shares in smaller private companies that do business with the Government. And at some point, obviously, you have to draw the line and say there is a conflict of interest. But I think that in fairness to all legislators in this Legislature and elsewhere, we should not rush to draw the line before we are sure just what its effects will be on all legislators.

I invite all Hon. Members to consider what is really a basic question of principle and I suggest that the amendment before us states a principle which we all should be able to adopt. It sets out a policy of providing, as near as possible, an equitable opportunity for all Saskatchewan printing companies to obtain printing contracts regardless of political affiliation providing they are able to do the work on a competitive basis, under fair wages and working conditions. I couldn't imagine why anyone would vote against that. I certainly intend to vote for it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, indeed the Premier is on thin ice today and I am frankly surprised about his attitude on this particular subject because I can assure him I do not at all agree with his opinion on this particular subject and I intend to describe precisely why.

He makes the point that there would be a number of Members in this Assembly that are shareholders in companies. Unquestionably there are. I also submit to him that this is a vastly different situation, Mr. Speaker. I can assure him that if I was one who is a major shareholder in a company that does business with the Province of Saskatchewan, I would acknowledge it, I would declare my interest in that company.

A major shareholder, Mr. Speaker, because there is a fantastic difference between owning 50 shares in a company that has 10 million out and being over the 50 per cent shareholder as such is the situation which presents itself to us today.

I cannot see in any stretch of the imagination how a Member who may own 100 shares with some company that has one million shares outstanding can possibly influence that company to any extent or even would probably have any desire to try to do so. It is well known that anyone who sits on a board of directors withdraws from that company's board of directors simply because he is in a position to influence the policy of that particular company and has influence on the government.

It is a far cry, Mr. Speaker, from the person who owns a few shares in that company and probably has no influence whatsoever over its policies, if indeed, he even knows any of the administration running that particular company in question. I think it would be well accepted by all Members here that any person who does have sufficient shares to occupy a position of influence in a company should declare them. If he hasn't declared them he certainly should be doing so if the company is doing business with the Government of Saskatchewan of which he is a Cabinet Minister.

In respect to the party opposite, it is obvious that they do have a very, very strong influence both through the Government and through the publishing company. They have precisely the type of relationship between the Cabinet and the company which I suggest should not exist between industry and the Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — I think that this is the point which the Premier has very, very widely missed.

With respect to what the relationship is between an advertising agency and the Government or any government and I presume that he is talking about the previous Government, this again I suggest to him is a much different situation as well. And the reason I do that, Mr. Speaker, is because presumably he is talking about a campaign contribution or donations of any kind. I suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that if he is sincere, which I suggest he probably is, that he and his Government should pass the laws which govern these situations so if any contributions forthcoming can be made public knowledge.

I remember when they were in Opposition they often moved a resolution and I suggest that if he wants to have a relationship that is understood by everyone governing business and political parties and I think he was referring in his comments of the possibility of campaign contributions simply because the Government does business with an advertising agency, then I suggest that his Party and his Government should pass laws which will bring these contributions under scrutiny so there will be no question as to their legality and feasibility.

So I suggest that he is skating on extremely thin ice, Mr. Speaker. He has attempted to try and make something sound as though it is all right. It isn't all right. The conflict of interest would exist very much between a major shareholder in a company doing business with the Government of Saskatchewan. And if the Party opposite sees no conflict of interest between their Party and the Service Printing Company then I think that the people of Saskatchewan will look very differently upon this prevailing situation. It is pretty obvious that much printing is very standard type printing. And many of the contract prices submitted will be very, very close together.

Mr. Speaker, when those prices are submitted and are very even it is going to be exceptionally easy to divide up the business so that a portion goes to Service Printing and a portion goes to the other printers simply because the prices will be exceptionally close together on the standard type of printing operation. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that the Party opposite can convince the people of Saskatchewan and those of us in the Opposition that a conflict of interest does not exist between the Public Service Printing Company and the Government of Saskatchewan. And we intend to point this out and will continue to press for some relationship between the Party opposite, the printing company, that does not make a farce of what has been very strict laws governing a conflict of interest situation in the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I obviously will be supporting the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park):** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is well at this moment to return to the original motion which says that we oppose any policy of the Government to provide printing contracts to Service Printing Company which is solely owned and operated by the CCF Publishing Company Limited which is owned by the membership of the New

Democratic Party (Saskatchewan division).

The Premier went through what is frequently referred to as a judicial polka and he drew some fancy distinctions. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal of difference between a company which is incorporated for profit – to put money in the hands of shareholders – and a company such as Service Printing Company Limited which is entirely owned by a political party for the purpose of promoting a particular philosophy and . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — . . . for the purpose of using the profits that it earns to elect Members of the Government and, directly or indirectly, to sponsor and promote that philosophy.

Any attempt by the Premier to compare the CCF Publishing Company Limited with any other company is not justified. It is inadequate and it is nothing like a subtle distinction. Comparing a minor shareholder in Imperial Oil with a Member of the Benches across the way is not reasonable and not fair and will not be swallowed by the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLeod:** — We have here an attempt by this Government – I shouldn't call it an attempt – it is more than an attempt, it is actually a successful transference of public moneys, moneys of the people of Saskatchewan to a political arm, a subsidiary of a political party. And nothing the Premier can say will change the fact that what is happening is that this Party is using public money to get themselves re-elected if they can do it. I suspect that part of what they are doing is a form of political gerrymander.

There was a lot of talk of principle back in February, March of last year.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sensitive about that . . .

**Mr. MacLeod:** — I have no reason to be sensitive. Not only do I not have reason to be sensitive, you can do what you like with the seat – you will have trouble winning it anyway.

But you are suggesting, ridiculously, self-righteously that the CCF Publishing Company Limited is in the same category as some accidental piece of business done by a company which may have a share ownership by a Member on this or that side of the House. That is ridiculous and will not be accepted.

I have one more comment – that I favor the amendment. It is sensible. It would be very sensible except for the fact that it totally glosses over the fact that you deliberately and arrogantly and apparently are determined to continue the policy that you have started out, namely, you are going to use public funds for your private purposes, your political purposes and you do not intend to be deterred and if necessary, you obviously intend to use your overwhelming numbers to continue that bad practice against principle.

March 28, 1972

I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 4 – PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. Matsalla (Canora):

That this Assembly commend the Government of Saskatchewan for action taken in bringing forward public work programs in the early fall of 1971 and in extending and supplementing Federal Government programs for the relief of winter unemployment;

Expresses regret at the tardiness of the Government of Canada in announcing its winter employment programs and at the dilatory manner in which municipal applications under the Local Initiatives Program were processed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration;

And further that this Assembly endorses the proposal for a joint examination of the existing programs, by federal, provincial and local governments, to evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and to prepare criteria, guidelines and contingency plans for the winter of 1972-73 under varying assumptions of unemployment levels.

**Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, to me it is inconceivable that this motion be brought before this House by a Government Member.

The facts of unemployment are obvious to all Members of this House. To imply that the Government to your right should be commended for its actions to relieve winter unemployment is contrary to all the facts. If the Member was serious when he moved the resolution then I can only assume that he had his head in the sand. This is the attitude assumed by the ostrich when it is unable to face the realities of the surroundings. The ostrich thinks that if he hides from the problem, ignores it, or does not himself see the problem, then he foolishly thinks that there is no problem and that it has disappeared.

Mr. Speaker, the rest of the world knows that the ostrich only fools himself and that it is a silly attitude to assume.

The motion before us commends the Government for its action on the unemployment problem. How can a Member commend this Government when it produces one of the highest unemployment problems this province has ever seen?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) commends the Government while 20,000 people are walking the streets looking for jobs.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I had thought the facts were known to this House but for

the benefit of the Member for Canora I will review them.

June, 1971, the unemployment rate 2.5 per cent; July 2.7 per cent; September 2.8 per cent; December 5.4 per cent; February 6.1 per cent. Does the Member really feel that a commendation is justified in the light of these facts?

Let's look at in terms of people. In June when this Government took office there were some 8,000 unemployed. By September-October 10,000 people were looking for jobs. November 12,000 people were looking for jobs. December 18,000. February 20,000 people looking for jobs. I wonder if the Member for Canora expects the 20,000 people out of work to join him in commendation of this Government's inaction, in this Government's blunders regarding unemployment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite find it very easy to try and shift the blame of this to the Federal Government. Again, let's look at the facts and we will see that this is again simply an act of hiding his head in the sand.

One year ago Saskatchewan had the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. It was not 6.1 but rather it was 4.6. This took place, let me remind him, under the management of a Liberal Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The lowest in Canada. I didn't hear the Member opposite commend the Government for its action at that time. In fact, we saw the contrary. Members opposite berated the Government one year ago. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how the Member opposite justifies his position when he downgrades efforts that produced 4.6 per cent unemployment and then commends the action that produces 6.1 per cent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Simply unjustifiable, just a case of burying his head in the sand.

One year ago Saskatchewan enjoyed the lowest unemployment in Canada. This is not the case today. There are three or four provinces lower than we are. Alberta to the west is lower, Manitoba to the east is lower. The NDP Government has made Saskatchewan into an island in the prairies where 20,000 people are looking for jobs. If there is any Government in Canada that should avoid talking about the actions regarding unemployment, it is the Government of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — This motion brought forward by the Member for Canora must be an embarrassment to the Premier and to the Cabinet. The Member is, in effect, commending the Premier for producing one of the highest unemployment rates our province has ever seen. The Member is commending the Cabinet for allowing 20,000 people



to go without jobs. The Member is commending the NDP Government for its ineffectiveness. I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that I do not know the Member from Canora very well. Maybe I misjudge his motive. It is possible that the Member has some kind of dry sense of humor. It is possible that he is not able to make his voice heard in caucus. It is possible that some Members opposite are concerned about the problems of unemployment. This motion may have been put facetiously. I can't think of a better way for the Members on either side of the House to draw attention to the ineffectiveness of the Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — It is possible that commending this Government for this crisis it created is indeed a useful tactic to draw attention to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this side doesn't really care if either criticism or embarrassment will cause the Government opposite to take its head out of the sand and face the challenge of creating jobs. Then we will be satisfied.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The Province of Saskatchewan should thank the Member opposite for bringing forth this farcical motion to draw attention to the ineptitude of his own Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The Member talks about public works. Public works — the NDP's answer to all the problems. In fact, public works is the only NDP answer to creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP is not even making a success of its only ace in the hole. The Government, by innuendo, deed and action has discouraged private development. The Government is supposed to have a better method than that used by free enterprise and that better method, of course, is a fantastic public works program. The motion before us commends the Government on its public works program. It commends the very program that allows well over 20,000 people to walk the streets. It commends the program that was and is totally inadequate to deal with the urgency and the seriousness of the problem. What is even worse is that it commends the program that compared to programs instituted by free enterprise governments is pitiful and ill-formed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, in public works programs the free enterprise governments have beaten the NDP in their own backyard. The socialist Government has not even done a good job when they try to do their own thing. I suggest the Member from Canora compare this Government's program to that of the program one year ago that gave our province the lowest unemployment rate in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I ask the Member to check Saskatchewan Budget figures for the 1970-71 and 1971-72. He will find that job creating capital expenditures are down this year by over \$6 million. Mr. Speaker, this Government has shown its priorities when in a year of record unemployment the Government cuts back on capital expenditures.

**An Hon. Member:** — They are going to hire them all in the Civil Service.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Before commending this Government I suggest the Member compare the Saskatchewan public works program with that of Alberta. It should be remembered that the free enterprise Alberta Government doesn't put a top priority on public works to create jobs. The Alberta Government puts a top priority on private development and it's obvious that they are very successful. However, notwithstanding this, let's compare the two programs.

Alberta public works \$42.5 million, Saskatchewan \$11.7 million. Let's go even further and look at capital expenditures. Alberta \$223.4 million, Saskatchewan \$66 million. What is even more important in this time of high unemployment the Government of Alberta not only will be spending \$223 million but recognizing the unemployment situation this figure has been raised by \$29 million over last year. In Saskatchewan the Government apparently not concerned with unemployment, capital expenditure is not up by \$29, but is actually down by \$6.2 million. How can this Legislature be asked to commend a Government for its actions when these very actions create unemployment.

The Government opposite says that they are concerned about unemployment next summer. The answer is PEP. This Government is fooling no one by using the name of PEP. This is substantially the same Liberal STEP program. This is a program designed when unemployment was 4.6 in February. This year it is obvious that unemployment will be higher in the summer of 1972 than it was in 1971. The unemployment rate this February is not 4.6 per cent but it's 6.1 per cent. So, has the program been expanded to handle the anticipated unemployment program in the summer of '72? It has not. The program will employ less students this summer than it did last. Under this program the unemployment rate will not reach the low level of 2.5 per cent in June achieved under the former Liberal Government. This is an example of the callous approach taken by Members opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The Member from Canora downgraded projects under the Local Initiatives Program. He said they were not approved quickly enough and that they had other deficiencies. I would remind the Government opposite that it can take full blame for this. These Federal programs to alleviate winter unemployment showed their effect in every province in Canada except Saskatchewan. While other provinces showed a decline in the unemployment, our province climbed higher. The Saskatchewan NDP Government did the worst job of any Government in Canada in assisting local governments to take advantage of Federal programs. This Government gave bad advice and incomplete advice to local governments. This Government directed municipalities into the wrong programs.

March 28, 1972

As a result of the ineffectiveness of our Government we will see that Saskatchewan will not derive the same benefits from Federal programs that the provinces on either side, Manitoba and Alberta, will receive. As a matter of fact even though Manitoba has an NDP Government, I will admit that the province did an excellent job of taking advantage of Federal programs.

There seems to be a different priority by the two NDP Governments in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. The priority in Saskatchewan is to discredit and undermine the efforts of our Federal Government. There is no genuine effort made by the Saskatchewan NDP to co-operate with Ottawa to alleviate problems. The only effort made is to embarrass the Federal Government no matter what the cost to our citizens. The NDP want to win Federal ridings in Saskatchewan and they are prepared to sacrifice the people of Saskatchewan, the unemployed of Saskatchewan for their own political purposes.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I submit a motion, an amendment, seconded by my seatmate the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) that Resolution No. 4 be amended as follows:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line down to and including "Department of Manpower and Immigration" in the 10th line and substitute the following therefor:

expresses its regret that the Government of Saskatchewan did not develop a public works program in the fall of 1971 sufficient to alleviate the severe unemployment problem that existed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The debate continuing on the motion and the amendment.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just think that . . . I know that the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) is very, very anxious . . .

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order . . .

**Mr. D.F. MacDonald:** — I sent a copy.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald:** — I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Canora would want to listen with great care to the remarks of the Member for Moose Jaw and I know that he would want to re-examine his own conscience on his motion and I'm sure that he will be most anxious to stand up when he closes the debate and support the motion or the amendment of the Member for Moose Jaw and in order for him to gather and collect his thoughts, in order for him to stand up and give the kind of support that the Member from Moose Jaw needs in this particular motion, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

## **INTERIM REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF LIQUOR REGULATIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN**

**Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River)** moved, second by Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview), **That the Interim Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan be now concurred in.**

He said:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak upon the report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan. At the conclusion of my remarks I will move, seconded by Mr. McPherson that the Interim Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan be now concurred in.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this report I first want to commend the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) for the fine work he did in chairing the Committee up to and including the completion of this interim report. Undoubtedly the public hearings were among the finest I've ever heard in terms of an atmosphere of openness and friendliness. Mr. Brockelbank's chairmanship was characterized by his natural graciousness and good humor for which both he and his father are deservedly well noted.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Faris:** — I wish also to record my own sense of loss at the passing of Mr. Russ. Brown, the representative from Souris-Estevan. His good judgement, wide experience and friendly manner were missed by all the Members of the Committee.

The Committee, in my view, has worked hard and worked well. The subject matter is controversial. The members of the Committee range in their personal habits in the use of beverage alcohol from total abstinence to the use of significant amounts. A wide range of religious views are represented. Despite this, the viewpoints expressed have never been along political party lines. It has been a good experience working with this Committee and I look forward to its future deliberations.

The Committee's terms of reference were that we should conduct an enquiry into all aspects relating to the sale, advertising, distribution of alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan. The Committee believed that it was the intention of the Legislature that its enquiries be thorough and therefore set out three areas of study and research.

1. A review of present legislation and regulations regarding alcoholic beverages in Saskatchewan,
2. A review of existing legislation and regulations regarding alcoholic beverages in other jurisdictions,
3. A review of production, distribution, advertisement, sale and use of alcoholic beverages.

Wide publicity was given to the Committee's work and particularly for the eight days of public hearings which were held in Saskatoon, Lloydminster, Tisdale, Regina and Yorkton. The Committee received over 150 written briefs, 74 of which were

heard at the open public meetings. In addition the Committee met in closed sessions with law enforcement and other public officials. As a result of these public and private hearings it was agreed that certain changes should be made and that it was in the public interest that they be made soon. There were other recommendations which, while not of urgent nature, were included in this interim report simply because of the unanimity of the Committee in regard to them. Indeed, every recommendation in this interim report was unanimously agreed upon. There are on the Committee no dissenters from this report. While the recommendations of this report have received unanimous approval that is not to say that approval was given for the same reasons. I add that caveat lest it be thought that in presenting the reasons why I feel that the various recommendations should receive this Assembly's approval it is thought that I am thereby presenting every other Member's view.

In a matter as highly controversial and emotionally charged as liquor laws every man's conscience must be his guide. Each of our consciences has received different sets of information from our various religious, social and personal experiences. I can only say that, for myself, I am deeply concerned about the abuse of drugs in our society. The best evidence that I can find tells me that the most commonly abused drug in our society is beverage alcohol. It is of interest that in briefs to the Committee that even among those who may have personally felt that prohibition was desirable, they did not advocate it as a public policy. There are those who advocate voluntary total abstinence as the safest and wisest course but this is on a personal basis. The use of beverage alcohol is an accepted practice in our society. Voluntary total abstinence remains a meaningful, personal option but public policy must be aimed at encouraging moderate and socially acceptable patterns of consumption. Drunkenness and alcoholism, which are not the same, must both be avoided.

When the final report is tabled it is our hope to have a package of policies that will help reduce both drunkenness and alcoholism. This interim report in many regards might be said to deal with relatively minor issues. It is certainly not as far-reaching as the 1958 report on its impact on drinking patterns. That early report was an excellent document and provides many guidelines which stand today. In looking at the particular recommendations, the first three stand together. Lowering the age of majority by one year, establishing a system of identification cards, and increasing the penalties for those who abuse the age limits, stand together as a package. It is not a tremendously significant thing to lower the age by one year, yet in defending the arbitrary decision to draw the line at any particular age, any parents in discussing this matter with their children may now point to the consistency of this age limit with the right to vote in Provincial and Federal elections. There is some logic to say that if you are old enough to vote and you are old enough to fight for your country, then you are old enough to drink. The logic lies in the fact that rights and responsibilities must go together. If an 18-year-old has these rights then he must have the corresponding responsibilities. Both the identification card and increased penalties for abuse of this age limit indicate that we expect this limit to be enforced and indeed enforced more stringently than at present. These laws do not deal with the real problems that already exist with the age at 19 and that is that every day experience and countless social surveys show that many

young people experiment with drugs including alcohol long before they are 18. They do this experimentation often under very undesirable circumstances, using harmful substances, undesirable companions and often with harmful results. Hopefully, the final report will deal with this vexing problem.

The serving of wine, beer and spirits on Sunday and holidays from noon on received wide support from the public. It is felt that there is no logical reason why people should not have the public right to do what is already a private right in their homes. Those who are opposed to the public consumption of alcohol on Sunday should logically be opposed to public consumption of alcohol on every other day. While there are those who personally hold this view, there are very few who advocate it as a public policy.

The fifth point simply extends licensed dining rooms into the provincial parks. This is in line with the 1958 proposal that the consumption of alcohol be associated with meals as much as possible.

The sixth point merely extends to beverage room customers the right to drink a spirit if they prefer it to the beer and wine already available.

The next three points are for the Liquor Board Stores. The Committee feels that the public desires the more attractive facilities associated with a self-service store. I might add a personal note in saying that the present design of liquor stores seems to suggest that purchasing liquor is a criminal activity. I see no reason why they should not be far more pleasant in their décor. The reasoning behind the recommendation for the later hours for Liquor Board Stores in major urban centres is to curtail bootlegging. Law enforcement officers made it very clear that not only does bootlegging exist but that it benefits from the early closing of liquor outlets. They emphasize that bootlegging does not exist in isolation from other crimes but helps finance gambling, prostitution and other criminal operations.

The tenth recommendation is based upon similar reasoning. The option is given to operators to close earlier as in fact local customs will dictate the hours rather than the hours dictate the customs.

The eleventh recommendation is meant to provide a service to tourists in the North of the province that they can already receive in the South and, incidentally, to deal a blow to northern bootleggers.

The twelfth point merely extends to aircraft within the province the privileges which are associated with interprovincial flights.

Mr. Speaker, this is an interim report. The final report will deal with the more complex issues of research, education and rehabilitation. We hope to complete the report sometime in August. I hope to be able to point to a report that will lead the nation in the prevention of drinking problems. No other area of life is more important than that the privileges and responsibilities of a citizen be closely related.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about the report and just go into some of the details. I was going to ask the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) to leave the House while I made these remarks but I see he is still sitting here.

First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Brockelbank) who was our first chairman, for the excellent job that he performed. I must say, Mr. Speaker, he was certainly fair and conducted the hearings and all the Committee meetings in a very wonderful manner that was the way they should have been. I might say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that it was a good Committee and the Committee looked into all aspects of the liquor problem. Mr. Speaker, I for one and the rest of the Members on this side of the House appreciate the manner in which the Committee undertook to solve the problems of liquor. There was a total of 150 briefs presented to the Committee, many personally and others written. The hearings were well organized with all people who desired to speak before the Committee having an opportunity. Mr. Speaker, the report is unanimous with both the Government Members and the Opposition Members working hard to bring in an interim report that would present to the people of Saskatchewan the changes that have been required for many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of education and rehabilitation, the Committee could not deal fully with these subjects at this time. I can assure this House that the Committee to a man realizes that both education and rehabilitation programs must be increased.

First on education, Mr. Speaker, it is the aim of the Committee to see where alcohol education in the schools can be improved. It is my aim, as a Member of this Committee, to urge the Committee to request a sum of money that will tie in with the Education Department and the education system to bring to our young people one of the best alcohol education programs for all grades in Canada. I believe this and the Committee believes that this is one way that we can teach the young people the dangers of excessive use of alcohol.

It is also my goal, Mr. Speaker, to see that Members of the Committee are put in a position where they can recommend that further sums of money be set aside for the Alcoholism Commission to provide the kind of rehabilitation program that the Province of Saskatchewan needs. The people in the rehabilitation at this time are doing an excellent job but they need more funds to halt the ever present drinking problems.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that every member of the Committee is dedicated to make sure that,

1. We put funds in the education system to provide education for the students on alcohol,
2. The Committee wants to provide sufficient funds so that we may provide an adequate rehabilitation program for Saskatchewan citizens.

I would urge the Government to make available adequate

space both in Regina and Saskatoon to provide in-patient and out-patient departments in these centres so that we can keep up this worthwhile program that is being conducted.

On the education program, Mr. Speaker, first for the primary prevention action, we would like to provide information that would enable people to avoid problems involving the inappropriate use of alcohol, secondly, we need a secondary prevention action. We want to provide information so that people could recognize alcohol problems in the early development stages and where to seek help and where to go.

To achieve the above needs, Mr. Speaker, there are four main population segments that must be reached. First, the young people. We must reach them in the schools and in the homes. Secondly, the employed people. We must talk to management and to unions. Thirdly, problem people, the addicts and their families. Fourthly, helping people – professional people – to provide services to reach through undergraduate and graduates of formal training.

In the rehabilitation program, Mr. Speaker, first, we must find a cure for alcoholism. It is a disease. Secondly, prepare individuals treated for a meaningful role in society and this we can do very well. Desirable treatment objectives should be a complete cure. A complete cure means alleviating the manner of the system and the elimination of the cause. The breathalyzer has been put in the city of Regina. I would like to go over a few of the figures that have been presented by the Chief of Police. Last year the number of breathalyzer tests conducted were 1,166 and as a result, a number of suspensions over a 24-hour period amounting to 996. The number of Criminal Code drinking-driving charges were 957. There is one thing I should like to make very clear. A lot of people are worrying about the young people but there was only one fatal collision where the driver had been driving and that driver was of the age of 19.

I bring these points out, Mr. Speaker, so that all can see that the Committee has done a report, an interim report that deserves the support of the House. There are many Members, Mr. Speaker, who would like to speak on this and I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) that **Bill No. 9 – An Act to provide for the appointment of a Person to Investigate Administrative decisions or acts of Departments of the Government and certain other Organizations and to define the Person's duties, functions and powers** be now read a second time.

**Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview):** — Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in this debate, first I should like to say that in recent years social and technical innovations have so affected the complexity of society that the individual has increasingly had to look to his government to play a greater part in influencing those events which



affect him. It is in Canada, Mr. Speaker, however, our tradition that the state is a servant and not our master. We believe that a citizen has important rights which the state cannot disregard in its dealings with the citizen. As the scope of government endeavor broadens and the complexity of its activity increases, it becomes more and more difficult to ensure that these rights to which a citizen is entitled are not either denied or overlooked in his dealings with his servant. Any country which believes in individual rights must therefore provide itself with an adequate system of checks and safeguards on the misuse and abuse of the authority invested in the government officials. One such safeguard, Mr. Speaker, is the Ombudsman scheme. The Ombudsman's function is to examine administrative action to ensure that citizens are fairly dealt with. The need for appointing an official, Mr. Speaker, lies primarily in the fact that the average citizen has neither the experience nor the access to information necessary to ensure that he has been fairly dealt with by the government.

Is there a need in Saskatchewan for such an office? A look at the Alberta experience is instructive in this regard, Mr. Speaker. Of the 791 complaints received in 1970 by the Alberta Ombudsman, 286 were fully investigated by him. The other complaints were either outside his jurisdiction or were referred to other agencies. Of those 286 complaints investigated 22 per cent were found to be justified and of those 22 per cent justified there was only one instance where the Ombudsman felt he had been unable to suitably rectify the problem by use of his powers of negotiations. This means that in the area where the Alberta Ombudsman has jurisdiction only one individual did not get redress where the Ombudsman was of the opinion injustice had been done. It is important, Mr. Speaker, also to remember that 78 per cent of the complaints were found to be not justified. In most of the cases the individual ultimately received an explanation and a hearing and many frustrations caused by misunderstanding were disposed of. Also important, Mr. Speaker, 78 per cent of the civil servants unjustly accused of bias, bad faith, etc., were supported by the Ombudsman which leads one to believe that the Ombudsman can favorably affect the morale of the Civil Service, at the same time, bringing fair hearing to the complaints.

What arguments can be levelled against the concept which appears to have on balance worked very well? First, Mr. Speaker, an Ombudsman is unnecessary when we have 60 MLAs and an interested Press. This argument is a smoke screen, Mr. Speaker. The major tool an Ombudsman has for exposing injustice is his power to call for departmental files and summon witnesses. Obviously, MLAs and the Press do not and cannot have this power. It has been suggested that the Ombudsman is an expensive luxury in a province the size of Saskatchewan. Not correct, Mr. Speaker. The expenditure necessary to support an Ombudsman scheme is trifling compared to other less useful Government expenditures. And if the Ombudsman functions were expanded to take in local government, he would, without a doubt, have as much work as he could handle.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the McClure Commission on Civil Rights in Ontario cautioned that the Ombudsman may become a red herring obscuring the need for more far-reaching reforms. This Commission seems to have accomplished something that others have had difficulty in achieving and that is to put the Ombudsman idea in proper perspective. They preface their conclusions

on the matter in this way, Mr. Speaker,

In coming to any conclusion as to whether an Ombudsman or parliamentary commissioner should be established for Ontario, one thing is clear, and we place great emphasis on it. An Ombudsman is not a substitute for a proper legal framework which provides adequate substantive and procedural safeguards for the rights of the individuals.

Much has been said and written about the Ombudsman as a protector of the rights of the individual and this is misleading for the public and goes far beyond any claims that are put forward for the office by those who occupy it in any country. The real safeguards of the rights of the individual lie in good legislation and good rules of procedure designed to guide and direct those who make decisions in the administrative process of government. Rules that give a right to be heard before decisions are made affecting the rights of individuals and the rights to written reasons for decisions when decisions are made together with a right of appeal or review by a superior body having power to correct rights for which Ombudsman is no substitute.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that an Ombudsman scheme is non-compatible with our system of ministerial responsibility. In our parliamentary system the Minister has the power of control and direction of the administration of his Department. The fact that he has power is the reason he can hold and be responsible. It follows, therefore, that the system cannot operate, that is the Minister can no longer be held responsible if some of his control is usurped by an Ombudsman. Responsibility is not affected, however, where the Ombudsman has powers of recommendation only because this in no way detracts from the Minister's control. In fact, a properly designed Ombudsman scheme actually enhances ministerial responsibility by making certain that infractions come to light immediately. An Ombudsman must not be able to investigate and criticize a Minister's decision. He must, however, be able to investigate and criticize a Deputy Minister's decision and a Deputy's recommendations to his Minister. There may well be intervening facts which will cause a Minister to accept and act on or reject a Deputy's recommendation. It is, however, Mr. Speaker, the Minister's decision and in our system he is responsible for the justification of that decision. That is ministerial responsibility.

Does Bill 9 introduced by the Government meet the needs of a workable Ombudsman scheme? We should ask ourselves this. For that purpose it is desirable and imperative that the Ombudsman have the full scope of operation consistent with ministerial responsibility. Controls are necessary that would not be needed in a different constitutional structure which as the one the Swedish Ombudsman operates under. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Ombudsman must not be allowed to investigate the Cabinet, the Assembly, a Committee of the Assembly or the Judiciary. Secondly, the Attorney General must be empowered to suspend the Ombudsman at any time for misconduct subject to ratification by the House at the earliest opportunity. Third, Mr. Speaker, the Assembly must have power to make rules for the guidance of the Ombudsman. Fourth, the Ombudsman must have no power to reverse a decision on his own motion but he must rather have power of investigation and recommendations only. Because of the natural constraints our system imposes on the Ombudsman, it is highly desirable that the Ombudsman be given as much scope and independence as possible.

What does Bill 9 do, Mr. Speaker? Bill 9 goes on to impose restrictions on the Ombudsman which make him all but impotent. Consider the following provisions in Bill 9. It prohibits the Ombudsman from investigating any act of a Deputy Minister or an Acting Associate Deputy Minister. Secondly, Bill 9 prohibits the Ombudsman from investigating an act of any person appointed or employed who is, in the opinion of the Attorney General, directly responsible to the Minister. Bill 9, Mr. Speaker, prohibits the Ombudsman from investigating any act done by any person in the employ of the Provincial Government in relation to any dealings he may have with a municipality, school board or with the Federal Government. Bill 9 also prohibits the Ombudsman from investigating any proceedings in local government or school boards. Bill 9 also, Mr. Speaker, allows the Attorney General to stop by issuing a certificate to the Ombudsman any investigation which in his opinion is not in the public interest. Mr. Speaker, Bill 9 also allows the Attorney General to withhold any departmental document which in his opinion might disclose deliberations of Cabinet which in his opinion might be injurious to the public interest. Nor does Bill 9 do away with Crown privilege generally in respect to such information as does the Alberta Act.

The very suggestion of such unnecessary restrictions is incredible. The McClure report has cautioned that even an Ombudsman with appropriate power may be a red herring. That such an Ombudsman may be a red herring, it is obvious that an Ombudsman as emasculated as the one proposed by the Government can be nothing but a red herring.

The NDP raised the issue of an Ombudsman in this House in the Throne Speech of February 6, 1964. The Premier introduced the idea from the Opposition after that time on several occasions. Surely, after eight years of consideration and with the benefit of the Alberta experience behind us, the NDP could be expected at this time to introduce a model of Ombudsman legislation. Instead, they have brought forward a Bill which is the least effective of any proposed or adopted anywhere in Canada with the exception, of course, of British Columbia.

Supporters of the Ombudsman concept, Mr. Speaker, are sorely disillusioned and disappointed by the empty Bill that the Government has seen fit to introduce. How could the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, have missed the mark by so far. I can hardly tell. It appears that the Attorney General either intends deliberately to make the Ombudsman a meaningless showpiece or he has relied on draftsmen who have no concept of the function of an Ombudsman, his scope and his relations to other controls in the administrative process. Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that either alternative is not particularly flattering to the Attorney General or the Government opposite.

The reluctance of the Government to open up all but the narrowest area of Government activity to the scrutiny of the Ombudsman is undoubtedly the major objection to the Bill. There are a number of other changes which should perhaps be incorporated into the legislation.

First, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House that Nova Scotia has enacted Ombudsman legislation which brings the activities of local government under the sphere of the Ombudsman. An Ombudsman scheme has been proposed in Ontario which would have regional Ombudsmen checking on the local government. It is at a local level, Mr. Speaker, where most dealings

direct with the citizens occur. That is where an Ombudsman may be most useful to everyone. Saskatchewan is not yet so populous that an Ombudsman could not cope with the local matters as well as provincial. Far from contemplating such a move, the Government refuses to allow scrutiny even of the Provincial Government dealing with the local governments. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not insist that local governments be included now, we have been given no reason to believe that the NDP will ever consider their inclusion. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the independence of the Ombudsman both in fact and in appearance is crucial.

Several suggestions should be considered in this area. First, Mr. Speaker, they bring in the salary of the Ombudsman. The salary of the Ombudsman should not a fixed figure. If it is, then salary increments awarded to officers with similar responsibility could be withheld from the Ombudsman if he was to displease the Government at any time. Rather, the Ombudsman's salary should be tied to that of say a Deputy Minister and would increase automatically if a Deputy Minister's salary went up. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, a two-thirds majority vote of the House should be required to remove the Ombudsman from the office which would make it less likely that he would be removed for particular reasons or for taking a stand which might be generally unpopular at a given time to the Government. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, a provision should be included in the Act that the Ombudsman not be allowed to hold any other office or to engage in any occupations for reward outside the duties of his office. It might be necessary to pay a higher salary if such a provision were included. And, Mr. Attorney General, I want you to take that into consideration. Third, Mr. Attorney General, the Ombudsman should not necessarily be restricted from investigating a matter merely because complaints do not have sufficient personal interest. Possibly the Ombudsman could act on such a situation on his own motion under section 12(2) but this matter is not clear and should be spelled out very clearly.

Mr. Speaker, section 32 of the Bill sets out the offences and penalties but it does not direct that a prosecution must be undertaken at the request of the Ombudsman nor on the direction of the Attorney General. Once again, it appears that the Attorney General, as the section now reads, might have discretion to sweep something under the rug. In short, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Saskatchewan Ombudsman Bill is one of the most ill-considered Bills to be placed before this Assembly at any time during the sessions of this House. The implementation of the legislation would seem to give us an Ombudsman, but in fact, it would really be a disaster. If the Attorney General is serious about providing the province with a meaningful Ombudsman he must withdraw this Bill and start all over redrafting. I urge the Members of this Assembly to join with me in rejecting this Bill and then in working to provide the people of Saskatchewan with a public watch dog who will indeed have the ability to watch. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Member takes his seat, if you will permit a question. Is the Hon. Member advocating that the Ombudsman should have the right to investigate administrative decisions taken by local governments in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. McPherson:** — No, I am not, Mr. Attorney General.

**Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobart-Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, the Member who just finished said a number of things with which we can all agree. He mentioned the complexity of society and the need for an Ombudsman because of this. There are very few of us who would disagree with this. There are many citizens who just don't know where to turn in order to correct a wrong that they have faced. The fact, as the Member from Lakeview mentions, that Alberta found that 22 per cent of the complaints were justified, I think is all the evidence that is needed to prove this point. And yet it seems to me that just a few days ago the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) on the same Bill said that there was no need for an Ombudsman with 60 MLAs and an active Press.

It seems to me that there is at least a basic difference of opinion. There has been some reference to the cost involved in establishing such a position. I was happy to hear the Member from Lakeview say that cost really didn't matter in this case because I think he is right. This is no luxury. It cannot be considered as such when we are protecting the rights of the individual. Protecting individual rights is never a luxury. He went on to mention good legislation that guarantees rights. I think this is what is being presented at this Session with the various Bills concerning discrimination such as The Fair Accommodation Practices Act.

Now, I can't help but wonder by the Deputy Minister should be different from the Minister in respect to the Ombudsman. My understanding has always been and it may be wrong, but it has been that the Deputy is an extension of the Minister and acts on his behalf. If this were not the case, then it seems to me that the Deputy and Minister would find themselves in rather a unique position.

Now, there was some concern that the Federal Government or its agencies manages to escape under the type of Ombudsman that is suggested by this Government. I cannot help but wonder just what an Ombudsman would have said about a year or so ago if he did have the power to investigate Federal actions when the Federal Government withheld payments under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Taylor:** — That is one time I would have certainly favored an Ombudsman being able to look into the question.

It seems to me that what we are doing is making a start and it's a start in the right direction. Now if the Members opposite don't want to make that start that's their business. I, for one, think that it is time, it's time to get underway and we hope, of course, if there are any glaring errors or omissions they can be corrected in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.